

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VII

AUGUST, 1906

NO. 2

Is Public Ownership Worth While?

IN HIS article on "Socialism and Public Ownership" Comrade Francis M. Elliott touches upon a most important problem of socialist tactics. He has well expressed a feeling that is growing upon an increasing number of socialist workers: besides teaching the general principles of a co-operative commonwealth, we must get into the very thick of our political and economic reality; if we are to rise above the stage of a debating club, and become a political party in fact as well as in name. Barring all theoretical arguments, the policy of utter neglect of the actual, burning problems of the day in one political campaign after the other has cost us thousands of votes in many places. And it is gratifying to see the tide turning, as I judge from the interesting study of "Lapis" on the Railroad Situation in the May number of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, and the article of Comrade Elliott, above mentioned.

In connection with the problem of Public Ownership there is a point or two that seems to need some elucidation.

One is the enormous quantitative importance of this problem, which few socialists realize. It is the superior contempt which the average "scientific" comrade bears to statistics, i. e., the scientific study of reality that makes him speak of public ownership as a petty superficial problem. A few statistical data will therefore not be amiss:

a) The assets of the street railways (including the electric interurban railways) of the United States amounting to \$2,545,-132,305.¹

¹ Street and Electric Railways, 1902 (Bureau of Census, Special Reports) Washington, 1903, p. 90.

b) The capital of the gas companies in the United States in 1900 was \$567,000,506. ¹

c) The total capital of the central electric light and power stations is not given, and their capitalization is a very uncertain thing to go by. This is stated as \$627,515,875 in 1902. But to be conservative we shall take the cost of construction as stated; namely, \$504,740,352. ²

d) The assets of the telephone systems at the end of 1902 were \$452,172,546. ³

Here are only four groups of franchise capital for which recent and reliable data are available; they do not by far cover all kinds of municipal franchise capital. Yet we are dealing here with \$4,062,000,000 — four billion dollars! A petty problem indeed! And if we go beyond the cities the total rapidly rises.

e) The telegraph system has assets amounting to \$195,503,775. ⁴

f) And finally the greatest sum of franchise capital is to be found in the railroad business, the commercial value of which was computed by Prof. Henry C. Adams for 1904 as \$11,244,852,000, not including the Pullman and private cars, which had an estimated value of \$123,000,000, so that the total for railroad property was \$11,367,852,000. ⁵

Here we have property to the amount of \$15,430,000,000 for the public ownership of which there is already a tremendous demand in this country. And to better appreciate these figures we want to remember that the total capital invested in manufacturing in 1900 was only \$9,858,205,501, i. e., that the franchise capital of six groups only was 56 per cent larger than the total manufacturing capital of this country.

Add to this the enormous mining capital, the socialization of which, as a so-called natural monopoly will undoubtedly be demanded as soon as the properties mentioned are acquired and here is a — comparatively — easy way to socialization of a larger share of the entire private property.

But is it worth while? the revolutionist impatiently asks, For you do not offer expropriation, you speak of capitalist public ownership which means acquisition of these properties for a fair price. Where, then, is the benefit?

Whenever I hear this question I very much feel like answer-

¹ Census Reports, Twelfth Census, Vol. X, p. 717.

² Central Electric Light and Power Stations, 1902. (Bureau of the Census, Special Reports). Washington, 1905, p. 108.

³ Telephones and telegraphs (Bureau of the Census. Bulletin 17). Washington, 1905, p. 12.

⁴ Bureau of the Census, Bulletin 17, p. 30.

⁵ Commercial Valuation of Railway Operating Property in the U. S., 1904. (Bureau of the Census. Bulletin 21). Wash., 1905, p. 7.

ing: My friend, remember your principles of your clear-cut, scientific, class-conscious socialism, — above everything else, class-conscious. How long have you been telling us that the interests of capital and labor are directly opposed to each other. And now observe, how violently capital, which is surely more class-conscious than labor in this country, how violently it fights any efforts at public ownership? Don't you think that is strong evidence that there is something in the tendency for labor?

But the problem may be approached in a more direct way. If only you will agree that gradual expropriation is a desirable method, you cannot but become an enthusiast of the public ownership method.

For there is, first, the method of purchasing franchise property, by right of eminent domain, at a fair price, which need not necessarily be equal to the market price. There is your first step at expropriation. Second, franchise property, being monopoly property, must inevitably rise in value, and rapidly. With increase of population, growth of cities, nothing acquires the "unearned increment" as rapidly as franchise capital, and an early socialization, nationalization or municipalization (choose any term you please) means so much surplus value torn from the teeth of the capitalist class.

Third, the gradual reduction of the interest in the bonds issued to purchase these properties, would be as painless a method of expropriation as can be devised.

Granting that the day will come when the Socialist Party will make up and find itself in the majority in both houses of Congress, and with a comrade in the White House and will then proceed to introduce the co-operative commonwealth, I think the most revolutionary comrade will agree, that the problem will be much simplified if more than half of the actual capital will be in the possession of the nation, though it be through the capitalist class state.

Meanwhile, think what an object lesson these naturalized industries would be! What a stimulus they would give to public life! How much more real political life would be for the average citizen; even the most backward one!

One very important political consideration must be emphasized: With the elimination of franchise capital the most powerful stimulus of political corruption will be removed. We socialists, sufficiently attack the dishonesty of old party politicians. Yet it is well known by his time, that the most potent source of corruption is not so much the moral depravity of the politicians, as the temptations that are put forward by franchise capital. And this demoralization reaches far beyond the professional leaders; it permeates the public mind, and does a great deal towards making politics a game of sordid personal interests. And

only when our citizens will learn to put class interests above purely personal interests will our propaganda succeed in overcoming the poison of political boodle.

I can hear the hackneyed arguments that public ownership, or municipal ownership will only lead to an increase of political corruption, because of the low moral standard of capitalist politicians. But I must emphatically assert, that past experiences do not warrant such pessimism. The cases of corruption in the federal public service are probably better known to the writer of these lines than to the majority of the comrades, yet I doubt very much if all this federal corruption for an entire century equals that amount of public property stolen, say, by the Chicago Street Railway Companies alone. And it stands to reason that in its fight *for* public ownership the Socialist Party must necessarily fight for civil service, the referendum, the initiative and the recall, which will go far towards making our government clean and democratic. And the Socialists have nothing to lose and everything to gain from such a rise of our political morality.

I certainly do not expect public ownership of franchise enterprises to solve the social problem in its entirety. Yet I cannot agree with Comrade F. M. Elliott, when he contemptuously speaks of it as "so superficial a remedy." Without being complete, it is far from being superficial. And for the following reason:

Fortunately we are done with the "impossibilist," who thinks the two words "co-operative commonwealth" a sufficient platform for the Socialist Party to stand upon. We are not discussing any more the necessity of immediate demands. One need not be a revisionist or a Bernsteinist, to admit the feasibility of an immediate improvement in the condition of the working class. And we are not any more frightened by the fetichism of the "iron law of wages." It has been adequately established, not only by English but even the limited American experience in municipal ownership that the wageworker profits by it, both as a consumer and a producer.¹ And the number of *workingmen* employed in the six franchise groups enumerated, is enormous:

Railways	1902—	1,002,979
Street Railways	1902—	133,641
Gas	1900—	22,459
Electric Stations	1902—	23,330
Telephones	1902—	64,628
Telegraphs	1902—	26,798

1,273,835

¹ An analysis of the data of the Gas Industry in this country shows that municipal gas plants sell gas cheaper, and pay their workmen better than private gas plants.

By this time it is about a million and a half of wage workers. Their improved economic condition is no small matter in itself, embracing as it does almost 10 per cent of the total *working* population of this country. But as an object lesson, the influence of the raised standard of life and better conditions of work would undoubtedly permeate the entire American working class.

By no means do I advocate the neglect of our final great aim. But let us not drift into the sweet current of visionary idealism. Let us make our movement a class-conscious movement of the working class in the full sense of the word. Let us not forget that we are not dealing with the German philosopher, who will vote for a hundred years in succession and patiently wait, wait; but with the practical everyday American to whom one solid fact is dearer and nearer than a hundred sublime theories! Then, and then only, will we utilize this strong current of dissatisfaction, this blind groping for better things, utilize it for our final aim! If we miss this exceptional opportunity, loud-mouthed demagogues will not; and we will remain what we have been for many decades — harmless dreamers!

STATISTICIAN.

Senate Reform in Canada.

FOR many years past the Canadian people have demanded the abolition or reform of the Senate: This body performs no useful service and is a burden of expense. In the session of parliament just closed the senators themselves discussed the question and the consensus of opinion was that although the upper house is not needed just at present it will form a powerful check on labor legislation when the proletariat secures control of the Commons, or lower house. The newspapers of the Dominion have devoted much space to the rise of labor in Great Britain and doubtless this fact had much to do in bringing about the discussion in Canada. The extraordinary growth of socialism in the Canadian province of British Columbia, where the two revolutionary socialist members of the legislature will probably be joined after the next election by at least five more, has also alarmed the ruling classes to no small degree.

The present Canadian Senate was formed in 1867, when the several provinces of the Dominion were united together by the British North America Act. The government was to consist of a Governor General, appointed by the British government as representative of the Sovereign, House of Senate and House of Commons.

Members of the Commons are elected by a vote of the people. The upper house differs from the British House of Lords and American Senate, for lords are hereditary and American senators elected for a term of years, while Canadian senators are not hereditary though they hold office for life. Each senator must be thirty years of age and possess real estate to the value of four thousand dollars. In this way the body is exclusive for the mass of the people do not possess the necessary real estate. No bill affecting taxation or revenue can originate in the Senate. It, however, has the power to reject measures brought up from the lower house but in most cases it acts as the willing tool of the party in power.

The Conservative (tory), and Liberal (grit) parties, corresponding to the Republican and Democratic parties of the United States, are the representatives of capitalist politics in the land of the Maple Leaf. The "Tories" were the first in power and they naturally appointed their own followers to the Senate. In 1873 this party resigned because of the Canadian Pacific railway scandal and was succeeded by the other representatives of capital. In 1878 there was another change but meanwhile a

good many old and feeble appointees of the "Tories" died and were succeeded by men of another stripe. The "Grits" remained in opposition for the next eighteen years. During this period they launched all their invective against the upper house. "Abolish the Senate" was their cry through press and on platform. It was shown that the house was a refuge for broken-down politicians, some rejected by the people and others considered of more harm to the party than good. It was also shown that the government leaders auctioned off seats in the body to party friends, receiving in some cases as high as \$30,000. The people naturally bit and as a result the "Grits" were launched in office in 1896. Since then the very men who were loudest in denunciation of the Senate have become its members and principal defenders, while seats have been auctioned in the same old way.

The result is that to-day the Canadian Senate is a body composed of would-be aristocrats, striving to be what is impossible in Canada, a second House of Lords. Formerly men were recruited from the legal and medical professions but so many of the larger manufacturers have secured seats that it may now be called a house of corporation lawyers, stock brokers and large employers of labor. There is not one bona fide workman in the house and it is doubtful if one of the three hundred or more men appointed since Confederation has represented the masses. They have been, in most cases, men up in years and therefore out of touch with the trend of events. Only one of the senators was under thirty-five when appointed while five of those to-day are over eighty years of age.

A year ago each senator's indemnity was increased \$1,500 a year and the radical element of the "Grit" party began to ask: "What about Senate reform?" It was felt that something must be done because the senators were drawing more pay, although their work had dwindled down to the passing of divorce bills. To secure a divorce in Canada a special bill must be introduced in the Senate. This costs money and usually a Canadian desiring a divorce resides in some state of the United States for the necessary time.

As the Senate cannot be abolished or reformed without the consent of its members a debate was opened early in the last session by Senator David, the personal friend and spokesman of Canada's premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, on a motion: "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency, the Governor General, praying that his Excellency will cause to be laid before the Senate, copies of all petitions, resolutions or documents concerning the abolition or reorganization of the Senate."

The Toronto "Globe," the chief party organ of the Government, in commenting on Senator David's resolution said: "Did Senator David, who propounded a plan for the reform of the

Senate, speak the mind of the Government? There are many people who think he did. Mr. David is the close personal friend of the Premier, and this fact lends additional weight to his utterances on the question."

He, naturally advocated reform and not abolition, proposing that of the members one-third be appointed by the Federal government, one-third by the Provincial governments and one-third by the universities and other public bodies.

In justifying the existence of such a body he said:

"There is now, and will be in the future, much necessity for second Chambers, especially in view of the great movement which is going on in the world towards extreme democracy.

"The struggle now is between labor and capital, between the millionaire and the trust, and the working classes. This struggle will be the most terrible the world has ever seen, but the ascendancy of the laboring classes is apparent. Gradually the labor classes are rising up, and before long they will domineer over the whole world. Personally I am not afraid. I would not be afraid of that ascendancy of the laboring classes if I were assured that they would be controlled by the best elements of the laboring classes. My sympathy is with the laboring classes but the time is coming when their demands, owing to the efforts of agitators and demagogues, will be exaggerated. When that time comes society will find protection in the second Chambers, which, with the Magistracy, will be the great bulwarks of society."

Senator McMullen, another prominent "Grit," said: "I do not think it would be wise to go back and have a second Chamber like this elected by the people. If that were done the probability would be that the influences which would be brought to bear by combinations, trades union, and such organizations, might be very powerful and they might be able to put legislation through both houses which they cannot do now."

The utterances of several other senators were of a like character, "Tory" and "Grit" forgetting their party differences for the nonce, because of that common enemy—labor. No vote was taken, the object of the debate being to merely learn the opinion of the members themselves.

Now what does it all mean? That in the course of a few years the upper house is to be reformed, not because the people demand it, but because *Capital fears labor.*

G. CASCADEU.

Concentration of Capital and the Disappearance of the Middle Class.

III

IN THE first chapter of this article, printed in the June issue of this magazine, we stated that the development of corporate methods of doing business brought in a new factor into the development of capitalism which apparently worked at cross-purposes with those tendencies of capitalistic development which, according to Marx, were to result in the destruction of the middle classes of capitalist society. We also stated there that this presented to Marx students the problem of harmonizing the Marxian prognosis as to the tendencies of development of capitalism with this new factor, and that the Revisionists were not equal to the task, and therefore came to the conclusion that Marx's prognosis was wrong. We interrupted the argument in order to give in the second chapter of this article, printed in the July issue, a characterization of the different social classes of the capitalist society which Marx had before him, in order to understand his position with reference to them. This was necessary in order that the reader may get the full meaning of the argument that we are going to present here in an endeavor to show that the Marxian prognosis of the development of capitalism and its ultimate fate, as well as the delineation of the social system which is going to take its place, need no revision, any more than any other part of his theoretical system. We shall now, therefore, return to our revisionist friends, and particularly to their leader, Edward Bernstein.

The main points of Bernstein's position on this subject, as already stated, are: 1st, that as a matter of fact the *concentration* of capital is not as rapid as Marx or some Marxists imagined or believed. 2d, that as a matter of fact there is no *centralization* of capital, that wealth does not accumulate in few hands only, to the exclusion of all others, and that the middle class is, therefore, growing instead of disappearing. And 3rd, that the reason for the divergence in the tendencies of the concentration of capital on the one hand, and the centralization of wealth on the other, is due to the development of the new social factor, the corporation.

This being a purely theoretical discussion, the first point can hardly be considered. Theoretically only the tendency of

the evolutionary phenomena is of any importance. What may, therefore, have been of every great importance in the discussion between Bernstein and Kautsky, which embraced other than purely theoretical matters, may be of only secondary importance here. The length of time which History will take to complete the evolutionary process outlined by Marx is no part of the Marxian theoretical system. Marx never stated it, and it could, therefore, only be surmised. But even if he had expressly stated it, that would not, of itself, make it part of his theoretical system. Besides, the ground is so well covered by Kautsky that one does not feel like doing less, and can hardly do more, than reproduce the Kautsky argument in full. And as considerations of space do not permit us to do that, we must refer those of our readers who may be interested in this phase of the discussion to the original.

As to whether, and how far, the second point made by Bernstein is of any importance in the discussion of the Marxian theory will be considered later. Here we will examine the phenomenon supposed to have been noted by him. We have already mentioned the fact that the only proof on which Bernstein relies to establish his second proposition are certain statistics as to incomes. But right here the fallacy of his statistical method becomes apparent. Aside from the fact that there is no standard by which you can measure the different grades or divisions of incomes as high, middle or low, and any such division must, therefore, necessarily be arbitrary, and aside from the fact that such standard must vary, not only from country to country, but even between places in one country and even in close proximity with each other, and (and that is of paramount importance) from time to time, there is the cardinal defect that income, as such, is no index whatever to either social or economic position. A man's income does not, necessarily, place him in any social position, and must not, necessarily, be the result of a certain economic condition, except under certain exceptional circumstances when, as Marx would put it, quantity passes into quality. The mere giving of a man's income does not, therefore, give his social position or economic condition, unless it be first proven that certain incomes can only be derived in a certain way, or from certain sources. Bernstein glides carelessly over from incomes to property, assuming that the derivation of a certain income implies the possession of a certain amount of property. But this nonchalance is due to an absolute lack of understanding of the real questions at issue. As a matter of fact, a given amount of income does *not* always, nor even in the majority of cases, indicate the possession of a given amount of property. A farmer, a manufacturer, a grocer, a teacher, an army officer and a mechanical engineer, may all have the same income, and yet

their social position, their economic condition, and the amount of property which each possesses may be entirely and radically different. The question is, or should be, not *what* is a man's income, but *where does he derive it from?* And, under what conditions, and in what manner does he do it. And this does not mean merely that the inquiry should be directed to the amount of property he possesses or whether he possesses any at all, but also that, if he does possess property, what it consists of and how it is employed in order to yield the income. The importance of this last point will immediately suggest itself if the reader will recollect what we said in the second chapter of this article on the psychological and ideological effects of the different kinds of property and the different occupations. But we shall discuss this more at length further below.

EFFECT OF THE CORPORATION ON CAPITALISTS.

As we have already stated, however, in the first chapter of this article, the real strength of Bernstein's argument does not lie in the statistical data with which he attempts to prove his alleged facts, but in the social phenomenon which he observed and which seems to counteract the evolutionary tendencies of capitalism described by Marx. The real meat of his argument lies in the third point mentioned above. The real question is: how does the modern development of that social economic factor, the substitution of corporate instead of individual economic action on the part of the capitalists react on the fortunes of that class. Our inquiry must not, however, be limited to the question of the division of income within that class, but also as to how, in what manner and under what circumstances, this division is being affected. We must find out not only *how much* each capitalist gets as his share of surplus-value created by the working class, but how his share is determined and what he must do in order to get it. In what relations does his getting it, and the manner in which he gets it, bring him to his fellow-capitalists, the other classes of society and society at large, that is, the social organization as a whole.

Bernstein says, in discussing the importance of the Marxian theory of value, that the fact of the creation by the working class of surplus-value, and its being absorbed by the capitalist class being probable empirically as a fact (to his satisfaction, of course) it makes no difference by what economic laws it is brought about. This may be good enough reasoning when one starts out from so-called "ethical" premises, but is absolutely inadequate from the scientific-historico-economic point of view. We have already sufficiently pointed out the great importance of the difference which does exist in its purely economic bearings, and now we wish to insist on it because of what might be

termed its social or ideological importance. For it is not the mere fact of the creation by one class of surplus-value or a surplus-product and its absorption by another class, but the *way in which it is done* that gives its character, including its *ideology*, to society as a whole and to each and every class and subdivision of a class therein. In examining, therefore, the influence of the development of the corporation on the fortunes of the capitalist class, it is not only the effect upon its *numbers*, but also and mainly the effect upon its *character* that is to be considered, for on the latter may depend the character of the whole social system. Upon the latter may also depend the durability of the social system and its speedy transformation into another. We shall, therefore, examine the question from both aspects.

And first as to *numbers*. Does the substitution of corporate for individual effort arrest the shrinkage of the numbers of the capitalist class or develop a tendency to its expansion, as Bernstein asserts? Decidedly not. And even Bernstein's empirical-statistical method, poor as it is, shows this. Bernstein does not deny the absolute and relative growth of the working class. And as the working class and capitalist class can only grow, aside from their proportional growth with the growth of population, at the expense of each other, they evidently cannot both grow at the same time. But this is just what is evidently happening if Bernstein is to be believed. Both the capitalist class and the working class are simultaneously growing at the expense of each other! Only the uncritical handling of *mere figures* could betray him into such an absurdity. A careful examination, on the other hand, of the actual phenomena under consideration would have shown him that while the corporation may arrest the rapidity of progress in the shrinking process of the capitalistic ranks, it cannot do away with the process itself. The capitalist class *must* shrink!

In the first place is to be considered the fact, already noted by Marx, that the corporation itself is a means towards the concentration of capital, with all that it implies. By combining the smaller capitals of the individual capitalists, and more particularly by turning over to the big capitalists the small capitals of the middle class and upper strata of the working class, either directly or indirectly, by means of banking and saving institutions, such tremendous concentrations of capital and industrial undertakings are made possible which otherwise could not, or only with great difficulty, take place. This places the whole industrial system on a higher plane of capitalization and must necessarily force out a lot of small capitalists by making their capital inadequate for the undertakings in which they are engaged, and the return on their capital, owing to the increased falling of the rate of profits, insufficient to sustain them. Thus,

while on the one hand this form permits these small people, or some of them, to combine their capitals and therefore gain a new lease of life, long or short as the case may be, on the other hand gives additional impetus to the very forcing out process which makes their individual independent position untenable. While in one way it retards the shrinking process it, in another way, accelerates it.

EXPROPRIATION THROUGH CORPORATIONS.

Another point to be considered in this connection is the fact that the corporation is the chosen and well-adapted means of all forms of dishonest and speculative undertakings, by means of which the unscrupulous rich manage to relieve the confiding, because helpless, poorer strata of the capitalist class of whatever individual competition has left to them. In times of "prosperity" all sorts of industrial and commercial undertakings are organized which no one would dream of organizing if he had to do it with his own capital. But as the corporation form permits the "promotion" of these schemes at the expense of the public, there will always be found enough "promoters" who are willing to "take a chance" with and at money of the "general public," which is composed of the lower strata of capitalism. This "public" not being in a position economically to compete with the magnates of capital are willing to nibble at their schemes in the hope of finding some profitable employment for the remnants of their former fortunes or their savings.

Then comes the panic or the "contraction" and all the bubbles burst leaving the field strewn with the corpses of the small fry, the would-be-capitalists despite the fact that their means were insufficient to give them standing as capitalists individually. Another and very important aspect of this phenomenon will be considered later in another connection. Here we simply want to point out the fact that the corporation is not merely a means of permitting the small capitalists to participate in the economic undertakings which they could not tackle on their own account, but also of relieving them of their small capitals, and either wasting them or transferring them to the large capitalists, directly or indirectly. This was pointed out at the beginning of the discussion by Kautsky, and since then we have had abundant proof of the great possibilities of this relieving process. The exposures of Thomas W. Lawson have shown that the very loftiest pillars of capitaldom engage in this relieving process, not merely as an incident to the natural "expansion" and "contraction" of the commercial world, but deliberately, with malice aforethought, manufacturing to order "expansion" and "contraction" in order to accelerate the relieving process. These exposures have also shown that where the small fry do not nibble

themselves in *propria persona*, their bankers, savings banks and other depositaries do it for them, as if they were vying with each other to prove the correctness of the Marxian prognosis.

It must not be assumed, however, that this relieving process is due entirely to dishonesty on the part of the big sharks of capitalism in dealing with their weaker brethren. On the contrary, the process itself is a natural one, due to the natural workings of the corporation. This process is only accelerated by the exposed "evils," by the abuses of the corporate form of doing business, for there are natural, as well as artificial, panics and contractions, and they all result in the transfer of the capitals of the small fry to the big sharks, or in their utter waste and destruction, as will be seen later.

Aside, however, from the "evils" and "abuses" of the corporation system, aside from the casual, although periodically recurring, waste of small capitals and their transfer to the big magnates of capital in times of panics and contractions, the usual and necessary results of the corporation system, its very *uses* and mode of operation are such as to make it almost nugatory as a preservative of the *numbers* of the capitalist class — as a means of staving off the destruction of the independent middle class.

The ordinary and usual course of corporation business is such that only a few persons, the rich who organize and control them, get most or all of the benefits derived therefrom. In order that we may clearly understand this point we must bear in mind the difference between business and loan capital. There is a difference between the return a man gets from his capital when he employs it in business himself and when he lends to another capitalist to be used in the same business. In the first contingency he gets all the profit that is made in the business, in the second only that part of the profit which is called interest. The amount of interest is not always the same as compared with the whole amount of profit realized, but it is always only a share and never the whole thereof. In determining the proportionate share of the owner of the capital and the undertaking capitalist, respectively, in the profits realized in the business, all other things being equal, regard is had to the risk assumed or undergone by the owner of the capital, the lowest proportion being paid as interest where the owner of the capital takes no risks whatever. This is interest proper. The balance of the profit, whatever is left after the deduction of this interest for the mere use of the capital with no risk attached, remains in the hands of the capitalist, according to capitalistic notions, for his work of supervision of the industrial undertaking and the risks involved in it. If a capitalist lends his money on insufficient security he gets higher interest. But this higher interest is

really not pure interest; it is interest proper together with an additional premium (part of the profit in its narrower sense) paid for the risk run by the man who makes the loan.

In a corporation the work of supervising the undertaking engaged in by a corporation is not done by the stockholders, but by paid officers and employes. These officers and employes are always the rich who organize and control, and they not only eat up all that part of the profits which go to the capitalist for his work of supervision, but usually a great deal more in the shape of high salaries and incidental expenses. That part of the profit of *all* of the capital interested goes to the big capitalists only, the small fry get none of it. And if by some chance a small capitalist should get this (which would only be possible in the exceptional case where all stockholders are small men) it would still remain true that only he would get it, and the ordinary stockholders would not get that part of the profit which goes to *every* independent capitalist.

THE SMALL CAPITALIST GETS ONLY INTEREST.

There remains, therefore, to the stockholding capitalist only the interest proper and that part of the profit which goes as compensation for risk. In this respect the stockholding capitalist is placed in the same position as the lending capitalist; the greater the risk involved in holding stock in a certain corporation the greater will be his return (if he gets any) and the smaller the risk the less his return in the shape of dividends. But the risks which he takes here are not only the risks of the business venture, but also those of dishonest corporate management. Besides, even in the question of the profitability of the business there is the possibility of fraud, for he is obliged to rely on the judgment of others who may be interested only in the venture to the extent of their ability to draw large salaries. The result of all this is that the prospective stockholder is desirous of investing in a safe corporation, that is to say, in corporations at the head of which are big capitalists who hold out some kinds of guaranty or promise as to results. But the safer the corporation the more is the investor, not only the bondholder but even the stockholder, reduced to the position of a person who lends his money to it, at least as far as the amount of profits he receives on his capital is concerned. This can be seen any day on the stock exchange. The safer the corporation the more is the dividend reduced to the level of mere interest. In speaking of dividend in this connection we mean, of course, the amount of the dividend as a percentage on the capital invested. Sometimes a very safe corporation pays very large dividends (although this is unusual) but in such an event the value of the stock will be so much above par as to bring the dividend down

to the proper level. The small capitalist who desires to invest in a corporation is, therefore, between the Scylla of taking all sorts of risks which are not present in the case of the independent industrial undertaker, and the Charibdis of getting no return on his capital except interest.

But as interest is only a share of the whole profit, and usually a small one at that, it is very evident that not all, and not even most, of the capitalists who possess sufficient capital to furnish them an independent income at the prevailing rates of profit, if they could remain independent undertakers, will be able to derive such income as stockholders of a corporation. A good many of them will necessarily have to fall out at the bottom. Usually these are the people who furnish the capital for all sorts of venturesome schemes with alluring promises which result disastrously. Being unable to maintain their position as capitalists by investing in safe corporations, they desperately risk their small capitals in these undertakings hoping to retrieve by a stroke of luck what they lost by the force of economic evolution.

But this is not all yet. Those smaller capitalists whose capital is for the time being sufficient to maintain them as *rentiers* of capitalism, as investors in safe corporations are by no means sure of their position. We have already shown that the rate of profit has a tendency to fall. With the falling of the profit falls that portion of it which is paid as interest, directly or in the shape of dividends, to bond and stockholders of corporations. This makes a capital which is sufficient to maintain a man independently to-day insufficient for that purpose to-morrow. Thus the falling out at the bottom process increases as capitalism progresses.

Some of the causes and processes noted above are slow in their operation. But one thing is certain, they are there and working their deadly havoc in the ranks of the capitalistic cohorts constantly and surely. The *tendencies* of capitalistic development cannot, therefore, be mistaken. Not only can the capitalistic class, that is, its lower strata which is commonly called the middle class, not grow, but it must surely and constantly *diminish*.

This diminishing process in the capitalist ranks, the passing from the capitalist class into the proletariat, may, however, and, owing to certain circumstances which will be considered later, does frequently assume such forms that the whole process becomes veiled and not easily recognizable. Here again the corporation plays a part, although not a very important one. Its part here consists in furnishing some additional folds for the veil which covers this process.

Some Marx critics, and Bernstein is among them, talk as

if Marx saw only one process, and that one the constant passing of former capitalists of the middle class into the ranks of the proletariat. No doubt there are some passages to be found in Marx's writings which at first blush give such impression. And as a general statement of a tendency this is true too. But that does not necessarily exclude some cross-current which may affect the original and prime tendency described by him, although it cannot completely negative it. Hence the danger of relying on single passages in Marx without careful examination as to their connection and the immediate purposes for which they are used, in the connection in which they are found. Hence, also, the ease with which all sorts of contradictions are found in Marx, according to his critics, as was already pointed out in another connection. It took Marx several bulky volumes to systematically expound his theoretical system, and then his work remained unfinished. He could not at each point recount all the circumstances which might affect or modify the tendencies or laws discussed which might be contained in other parts of his work. He assumed that the reader would remember them and read all the passages relating to the same subject together. Sometimes he purposely gave absolute form to a statement which he intended to qualify and made certain assumptions he himself did not believe in, intending later to modify the absolute form of the statement or show the incorrectness of the assumption, in order to more clearly and *systematically* present his theory.

As regards the matter now under discussion there can be no doubt but that Marx did not mean to say that *all* those who are reduced from the ranks of capitalism by the progress of capitalism become proletarians. Some of them may, for a time at least, remain in the position of half capitalist, half proletarian, in that they may derive a part of their income from their property and part thereof from their labor. But even those who have lost all their property may still become proletarians in the antique sense only, that is, persons who possess nothing, but they may not be proletarians in the modern sense of the word, that is, laborers who are not in possession of their means of production. They may cease to be capitalists and still not become laborers; they may live by their wits instead of by their labor, or become mere sponges on their former co-classites. It is our opinion that, with the progress of capitalism, the percentage of this last mentioned class of people is growing larger among those who lose caste by reason of the diminishing process of the middle class.

Hence the cry of the so-called "new middle class" raised by the Revisionists. Hence, also, the peculiar features of the statistics as to incomes. It is not because there is no process of Centralization of wealth accompanying the Concentration of

capital, as Bernstein would have us believe, that there is apparently a wide diffusion of small incomes which are not the proceeds of wages. This phenomenon is due: first to the fact that with the concentration of capital wage-slavery has been growing upwards, embracing constantly new occupations, such as by their character and remuneration were not properly within its domain on a lower rung of capitalistic evolution. This class has been particularly increased by the development of the corporation. And secondly, to the increase of the class of people, who, although not possessing any property, still manage to maintain themselves in real or apparent independence and without coming, formally at least, within the purview of wage-slavery.

This brings us to the question of the effect of the recent economic development on the *character* of the middle class. Before passing, however, to the examination of that question, we desire to note the fact that much of the talk and statistics about the supposed slowness of the process of the concentration of industrial undertakings is due to the merely apparent and formal independent existence of many undertakings and undertakers who are really mere dependent parts of a large, concentrated, industrial enterprise. And we also desire to mention here the fact that Heinrich Cunow, one of the ablest of the younger generation of socialist writers in Germany, has done splendid service in pointing this out.

THE "NEW MIDDLE CLASS."

But, somebody will ask, while it may be true that the processes which you have described show that not all the members of the present or former middle class can remain in their position of small capitalists, deriving their income from the possession of property, there still does remain this "new" middle class which you yourself admit is not reduced to the position of proletarians. This "new" middle class, while it possesses no property, or not sufficient property to count economically, is still a class distinct and apart from the proletariat, and if numerous enough is a force to be reckoned with. And as to the great numbers of this class, the income statistics are certainly an indication. Those incomes which can not possibly be the result of wage-labor must be the incomes of this "new" middle class, unless they are the incomes of the property owning middle class, and the income statistics therefore certainly prove at least one thing, and that is that the "new," property-less-middle-class, together with the old-propertyed-middle-class, certainly form at present quite a formidable class and diminish only slowly. Where is the difference, as far as the subject that interests us, (the approaching transformation from capitalism to socialism,) is concerned, between the old and the new middle classes? Isn't

Bernstein right, after all, when he says that if the coming of socialism were dependent on the disappearance of the middle class the socialists might as well go to sleep, for the time being at least?

In answer to such questions we will say: As already pointed out, it is not part of the Marxian doctrine that all middle classes must disappear before the advent of socialism, and the fact, therefore, that there may be developing a new middle class is no warrant for the assertion that the Marxian theory needs revision. Provided, of course, that the new middle class is sufficiently different to make a difference. It was shown already that Marx's prognosis as to the centralization of wealth through the disappearance of the property-owning middle-class is correct. And this is one of the decisive moments in the evolution from capitalism. It is not the merging of the persons who compose the middle class into the proletariat that is so much required as their severance from their property. For the passing of our society from its capitalistic form of production to a socialistic form of production, that is, for the socialization of the means of production, the only things that are of paramount importance are that these means of production should be social in their character, and the more social the better (the concentration of capital); and, second, that these means of production should lend themselves to social management, that is, be in the hands of as few persons as possible (the centralization of wealth). It is of comparatively little importance how the surplus-value produced by the working class, the income of the capitalist class, is distributed. The question of this distribution is of any importance only in two aspects: 1st, in so far as it reacts on the centralization of wealth by permitting greater or less numbers to maintain their position as property-owners; and, secondly, in so far as it may affect the ideology of the different classes of society.

In the first aspect, as we have already seen, the "new" middle-class is harmless. Its existence does not retard the process of the centralization of wealth, but, on the contrary, is its direct result. It is, therefore, only in the second aspect that any significance whatever could be attached to it. Let us see what it amounts to?

But before proceeding any further we must state that the possession of capital property being of the essence of a capitalistic class, the introduction of this so-called "new" property-less middle-class has created no end of confusion. A very great proportion of what is termed new middle class, and appears as such in the income statistics, is really a part of the regular proletariat, and the new middle class, whatever it may be, is a good deal smaller than might be supposed from the tables of incomes. This confusion is due, on the one hand, to the old and firmly-

rooted prejudice, according to which Marx is supposed to ascribe value properties only to manual labor, and on the other to the severance of the function of superintendence from the possession of property, effected by the corporation as noted before. Owing to these circumstances large sections of the proletariat are counted as belonging to the middle class, that is, the lower strata of the capitalist class. This is the case with almost all those numerous and growing occupations in which the remuneration is termed "salary" instead of "wages." All these salaried persons, no matter what their *salaries* may be, who make up perhaps the bulk, and certainly a great portion, of the "new" middle class, are in reality just as much a part of the proletariat as the merest day-laborer. Except, of course, in those instances where, by reason of the amount of their salary, they are in a position to save and invest. In so far as such investment takes place (as in the case of those who invest the remnants of their capital while depending for their support mainly on some useful occupation) they are on the border line between capital and labor, and are akin in their position to the ruined peasants who, before abandoning their villages, attempt to remain farmers by doing "something on a side." These cases are, however, not very numerous, and their condition is merely temporary. Another exception that should be noted is of those cases where the salary is so large that it evidently exceeds the value of the labor of the recipient. It will be found, however, in such instances, that such salary is paid only to capitalists who are really in control of the corporation which pays it to them, and is part of the process by which the big capitalists relieve the small ones of part of the profits coming to them. With these negligible exceptions, *salaried* persons are really part of the proletariat, no matter what they themselves think about it.

It is true that by reason of their descent, associations, habits and modes of thought these persons feel a certain solidarity with the upper class rather than with the class to which they belong. But this does not change their social-economic status, and, so far as their usefulness for the work for socialism, they present a problem which is only different in degree, but not in kind, from the general problem of the organization of the working class for its emancipation from wage-slavery. In the solving of the special problem, as well as in the general, the change in the character of the middle class is of quite some importance.

THE PASSING OF INDIVIDUALISM.

And the character of the middle class has changed. Nay, the character of the whole capitalist class has changed by reason of this substitute of corporate undertakings in place of individual enterprise. And not only this, but the character of our whole

social system is undergoing a change of quite some importance by reason thereof. And these changes have already wrought great changes in the ideology of the different classes composing our society, and are going to entirely revolutionize it. The famous phrase of a great English statesman: "We are all socialists now" was not as idle as some people supposed it to be. Of course the gentleman who uttered it may not himself quite realized its full import, but the fact that he uttered it is one of the proofs of its correctness, although he may have attached to it an entirely different meaning from the one we give it. Its real meaning is this: The philosophy of *individualism*, the ideology of private ownership of property, but particularly of individual enterprise, is doomed; and the philosophy of *collectivism*, the ideology of the collective ownership of the means of production and of the social organization of human enterprise, is fast taking its place. The change is taking place not only in the realm of jurisprudence, which is the immediate expression of accomplished economic facts, but also in the remoter fields of *art* and *philosophy*. As yet there is chaos. None can mistake the "breaking up of old ideals," but only very few can see the whole meaning and import of it: that a new society and a new ideology to correspond are forcing their way and making rapid strides.

Spencerianism, that purest expression of capitalism, and not so very long ago the reigning philosophy, is dead and forgotten. And every new day surprises us by the official throwing overboard of some remnant of that philosophy which was still clung to the day before. Socialism is the order of the day. But not merely the "menace of socialism," which merely reflects the growth of the organization of the working class, but the recognition of collectivist principles and the expression of collectivist ideas. The session of our Congress just closed gave remarkable evidence of that. It is not what was accomplished but what was conceded in principle that interests us here. It is not, therefore, the legislation or attempted legislation for the benefit of the working class only that must be considered, but all legislative attempts which show this change of ideology.

In this connection we desire to state that there is some basis of fact in the cry raised in some capitalist quarters that Roosevelt is more "dangerous" as a socialist than Bryan. We do not think much of the socialism of either, and believe that they are both quite "safe," but we really think that Roosevelt is not quite as "sane" from the capitalist point of view. The difference between them is that between reactionary and progressive capitalism. It is the difference between anti-trust laws and railway rate legislation. Both classes of legislation are purely capitalistic measures, designed to protect the small capitalists against the big ones. But the methods adopted are based on fundamen-

ally different social principles. As was already mentioned in an earlier part of this article, the anti-trust law is a capitalistic measure pure and simple, based on the theory that the State had only police duties to perform. Railway rate regulation, on the other hand, proceeds upon the theory that social means of production are there primarily for the benefit of society as a whole, and are, therefore, subject to social control. That does not mean that railway rate regulation is of any importance in itself. Neither regulation nor even ownership of railways by the capitalistic state are of any importance. But the assumption of regulation, particularly in a purely capitalistic country like the United States, is of significance as showing the drift of ideas. It is also of significance that attention is diverted from *incomes*, the Bryan mode of attacking capitalism, to the control of production, the field on which the real battles for the reorganization of the social structure, will have to be fought out.

These changes in ideology have not come about because people have obtained a "better insight" into the true relation of things, but because the basis of all ideology, the economic relations within our society, have changed, are changing. The private ownership of the means of production is the basis of capitalistic society, and therefore of all capitalistic ideology. And by ownership is not meant merely the derivation of revenue, but real ownership, that is, control. A capitalistic class not owning any capital, as the so-called "new" middle class, is a contradiction in terms, an anomaly. But no less anomalous is the position of a capitalist who owns but does not control his property. That wonderful artist, Gorky, with the true insight of genius, has divined this truth and has expressed it when he made one of his characters say that the true importance of wealth is the power of control that it gives one over other people. But this power of control does not lie in the revenue which one derives from wealth, but in the control of this wealth itself, which in our society is synonymous with means of production.

"MIDDLE CLASS IDEOLOGY."

The truth is that the "new" property-less middle class is not a capitalistic class. It is no middle class at all. It is true that it stands in the middle between the capitalist class and the working class, and in this sense it is more of a "middle" than the old middle class which was nothing but the lower strata of the capitalist class. But it is no class. A class is not merely an aggregation of individuals having a more or less similar income obtained in a more or less similar way. In order that any aggregation of individuals should really form a social class they must perform some social-economic function. The existence of the "new middle class" is entirely too aerial to give them posi-

tion as a social class. They are either merely "hangers on" of some other class, or hang in the air entirely where they obtain their income from "wind." This "class" has none of the characteristics and none of the ideas of the bourgeoisie which we have described. It not only has no love for property as such, because it does not possess any, but it has not even that love of economic independence and individual enterprise which is the characteristic of the true bourgeois. It has no veneration for property or property-rights, no love of economic independence, and consequently no constitutional abhorrence of "paternalism" or of socialism. All this "class" cares for is its *income*, and that is why its ideologists, the social reformers of all grades and shades put so much stock in the question of income and always push it to the foreground. To the old bourgeois, in control of his property, it was a question of freedom and independence; he looked upon socialism as upon the coming slavery, he abhorred it for its very comforts which everybody shared alike. Not so with the new middle class. Any one of them is ready at any moment to change his windy existence for a governmental job, service of some corporation or any other occupation, provided his *income* will not be diminished, or even if it is diminished to a certain extent, provided it is assured to him for any length of time. For it must be remembered that this new middle class suffers just as much from insecurity of income as the working class, if not more, to which must be added insecurity of position. It is very natural that a "class" so all up in the air should not form any firmly rooted ideology of its own, that it should be drifting all the time, and should, therefore, be almost worthless as a social force either for or against the introduction of a new order. But, on the other hand, it is because of the very nature of its social existence, extremely restless, ever ready to change, and ever longing for a change which would finally do away, or at least alleviate, its unsettledness, give it a rest. "Governmental interference" has no terrors for it. It feels the need of a stronger hand than that of the individual in arranging the field of battle for the struggle for existence. If such a make-shift may be dignified into an ideology, its ideology is State Socialism.

But it is not only the property-less, only-in-name, middle class that has lost its old bourgeois ideology. The remnants of the old middle-class, the stockholding small capitalists, have lost their ideology with the control of their property. For it was that control, the individual enterprise, that was at the basis of it. Furthermore, with this class as with the "new" middle class, it has become merely a question of income. For property without control is again a contradiction in terms. These people really have no property, although they and others imagine differently.

What they have is a right to a certain income. They are nothing but rentiers, annuitants, either of public or private corporations. They are ready at any time to, and do, exchange their supposed property for more formal annuities and other *rentés*.

Robbed of its economic independence, deprived of the control of its property and of the opportunity of individual enterprise, it has no other aspirations except to preserve its comforts, its incomes. If it has any ideals at all, its ideals may be said to be just the reverse of the old bourgeois middle class. By the very nature of its way of managing its affairs the propriety, effectiveness, and, above all, the necessity of socialization, is brought home to it. Furthermore, being minority stockholders, the members of this class naturally look upon the general government, the social organization as a whole, as the protector of its rights against the unscrupulous methods and the rapaciousness of the big capitalistic sharks. It is true their ideas in this respect are not those of the revolutionary proletariat, it is not the social organization of work that they dream of, but the social organization of the distribution of gain. By a curious mental process they fill the old forms of their ideology, according to which the State was merely a policeman, with an entirely new substance by extending the police powers to fields which would have horrified their fathers had they lived to see the thing. The ideology of this class, like that of the new middle class, is a curious mixture of old and new ideas, but one thing is clear in the midst of all this confusion, that its antagonism to socialism is not a matter of principle but of convenience.

Hence the "breaking up of ideals," the great changes in the ideology of capitalistic society which we have already noted. Hence, also, the so many different forms of "socialism" with which we are blessed. Hence, lastly, the "social unrest" in capitalistic quarters.

THE SOCIAL UNREST.

For it is a mistake to think that the "social unrest" comes wholly, or even mostly, from below. Of course there are moments of unrest in the working-class. But it will be found, upon close examination, that a good deal of it is merely the reflection of the unrest of the higher layers of society. Furthermore, it will be found that the more the working-class emancipates itself from the mental and moral domination of the upper class, the more it develops an ideology of its own, as we shall see in the next article. The less the "unrest" in its midst, the more steady its thoughts and actions become. Before the working-class ideology is full-grown, however, and while it is yet under the tutelage of the middle classes, the changes in the ideology of those classes which we have described are of great importance.

and the very restlessness of that ideology and psychology is of importance. For it first creates restlessness below, thus calling out nervous activity, and when that nervous activity has resulted in a firm and clear ideology it cannot offer any effective resistance.

Whatever, therefore, has been saved of the middle class by the corporation with regard to *numbers*, has been destroyed, and very largely by this very agency, as to *character*. What was saved from the fire has been destroyed by water. The result is the same: *the middle class*, that middle class which Marx had in view, the middle class which was a factor obstructing the way towards socialism, *is doomed*.

THE CORPORATION ABOLISHING PRIVATE PROPERTY.

This is not all, however. The corporation has not merely failed to save the middle class. It is performing a positive and great service in the work of transformation of our society from capitalism to socialism. That work is nothing less than the *abolition of private property* and the substitution of collective property in the means of production; the demolition of the basis of capitalism and the rearing of the ground work of a socialist system of society. It is hard to think of our capitalists as doing this work, but that is what they are doing nevertheless. In their frantic efforts to save themselves, the capitalist class is doing nothing less than undermining its very existence, cutting out the ground from under its own feet, abolishing, not only the basis of capitalism, but the basis of all class-society—private property. This fact has not been noticed hitherto and given the attention which it deserves, because, again, of the question of income which has obstructed our vision. Because our big capitalists get the benefits, the income of our corporations, it has not been noticed that they don't own the property from which these incomes and benefits are derived. In looking with rapturous gaze or hateful abhorrence at the enormous fortunes of our kings, barons and lesser gentry, the startling fact has been lost sight of that these fortunes are mere titles to revenue and not to property. The law recognizes this fact clearly. The great John D. Rockefeller, ruler of the great Standard Oil and all its domain, has no more title to any part of the property of the great corporation of which he is the master than the poorest elevator boy employed in one of its buildings, and should he attempt to appropriate a dollar's worth of it by using it for himself, the law will treat it as a case of conversion, or larceny of somebody else's property.

And let no one say that this is mere legal formality. *Legal forms always express economic realities*. Sometimes they survive their substance and become mere *empty forms*. In such

cases they are records of past economic realities. When they are not records of the past they always express *present reality*. In this case the form is full of substance. It not only expresses a present reality, but, as it happens, presages the future. As yet the collective form substituted by the capitalists is crude and undeveloped as to form, and the collective bodies are still "private," that is, the benefits derived therefrom are enjoyed by private individuals. The proper distribution of the benefits, that distribution which is suited to the new form of ownership, which in itself is only an expression of the new form of production, will follow as surely as harvest follows the planting of the seed. This work of readjustment of the mode of distribution to the new mode of production and ownership and the full development of all the three processes to the limit of their capacities for the benefit of all members of society will remain for the fully developed, organized and educated working class. But in the preparatory work of transition, particularly in the ruthless destroying of all the elements of the old social system, our friends the enemy have rendered, and are rendering, signal service. In their mad effort to escape their fate the capitalists are only *cheating the gallows* by committing suicide.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(*To be Continued*).

The Elections in Belgium.

CERTAINLY most socialists expected a more favorable result. However, a whole series of deep-rooted causes acting together explain sufficiently both the success of the government and the slight gain for socialism. It should be said in the first place that in Belgium the parliamentary elections are held every two years for half of the country, the term of a deputy being four years. Before the election the strength of the parties in parliament was as follows:

Clericals.....	93
Socialists.....	28
Liberals and Radicals	43
Christian Democrats.....	2

The total opposed to the government was 73. The strength of the parties today is:

Clericals	89
Socialists	30
Liberals and Radicals.....	46
Christian Democrats	1

The total opposed to the government is 77.—The seats are distributed according to a system of proportional representation. This is applied, however, in a very defective fashion, since the electoral divisions are too numerous, and are very unequal in size: some elect 18 deputies, others but two.

Of the deep-rooted causes, the principal one is the constantly increasing intensity of class antagonism. As was the case in France from 1860 to 1870, we have today in Belgium arrived nearly or quite at the maximum egoism on the part of the possessing class. The government may much better be called a government of business men than a Catholic government. They are Catholic only for the reason that to be a perfect business man in Belgium, it is also necessary to be a religious Catholic.

This is the epoch of business, of speculation, of great public works, of expositions, of colonial expansion. The Belgian has lost all his ideals but one, getting rich. It is especially the Congoish and corrupt policy of Leopold, Monarch of Congo, which has impelled the whole Belgian bourgeoisie to accentuate to the last degree its ferocious and unmoral egoism. You will thus understand that the best political results do not fall to a party, which like ourselves, is struggling for great principles.

A second profound cause is the ignorance and physical exhaustion of a great part of the working population, prostrated absolutely by the very fact of its material and intellectual poverty under the rule of the Roman Catholic clergy. Can you believe that in many places male adults earn in our country wages of but \$2.40 to \$3.00 a week by working twelve and thirteen hours a day, the women from \$2.00 to \$2.20 a week, and these laborers are assisted by their children from six to eleven years of age, or even five or four? Can you believe that of our 541,000 working men and working women engaged in manufacturing, as ascertained by the government figures for Belgium for the year 1896, 178,000, or about one-third, earn less than 50c a day; and that out of 600,000 working men and working women of all ages only 70,000 work less than ten hours, and 225,000 work eleven hours and more? Is it surprising if under these conditions the educational work of socialism is slow?

There are also causes of a more superficial kind. The system of plural voting, which gives a second vote to education and a third vote to property is naturally in its essence unfavorable to us. Moreover the system of proportional representation is nothing but a sham, from the fact that by cutting up the country into a great number of districts it comes about that in many of these districts in which we do not reach the number of votes which elects a candidate, the votes which we obtain in such districts are totally lost. For illustration, look at the combined figures for 1904 and 1906, which show the vote for the whole country.

For the Government.

In 1904	504,000
In 1906	636,000
<hr/>	
Total	1,140,000

Against the Government.

In 1904	598,000
In 1906	524,000
<hr/>	
Total	1,122,000

This ought to give 84 seats to the government and 82 to the opposition, while as we have seen the government has 89 and the opposition but 77.

Again, the Liberal Party was completely "demonetized" after 1884 and lost all of its vitality at least fifteen years ago. The business men (in industry, commerce and finance) passed over little by little into the clerical party, which defends their interests so well and lets them act as they like. For a considerable

time all the really democratic elements of the bourgeoisie have been voting the socialist ticket, but now a liberal organization has taken shape, and a few months before the elections the moderate wing of this organization declared for three great reforms: universal suffrage, compulsory education and personal military service. After all deductions are made, it must still be said that this declaration was far-reaching in its effects. It was a triumph for our immediate demands and the liberals appeared from that time as a possible democratic government. The inevitable thing happened: all those liberal democrats who for fifteen years had been voting for us without being socialists, returned to their first love and voted, especially at Brussels, for the liberals.

These are some of the reasons explaining why our progress has not been greater.

However, we have nothing to be ashamed of. We are in Belgium at a difficult moment and the party is at present making a thorough study of the question of method. Our penetration into certain quarters is too slow. It is true that the facts I have given above explain how poor is the land we are cultivating and how great and long-continued our efforts must be. Happily we are positivists. Our politics and our doctrines are alike scientific. We shall therefore find a way of adapting ourselves to our environment, which we are studying methodically from day to day.

EMILE VINCK.

Translated by Charles H. Kerr.

An Endless Task.

THE series of articles published by Comrade Boudin in the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW contains much that is good, much that is excellent, and much that deserves to be preserved in a permanent form. It also contains much that is shallow, much that is the fruit of hasty reading, and much that is false.

So long as Comrade Boudin deals merely with the simple problems of the first volume of Marx's *Capital*, or with the funny antics of bourgeois critics or semi-bourgeois revisionists, he is entertaining, brilliant, witty, and shows himself generally well posted. Little inaccurate statements, here and there, and slips such as may happen to any one when working under high pressure, are readily excused in view of the ludicrous misconceptions and gross falsifications of the Marxian theories on the part of the Neo-Marxists, whom Comrade Boudin is compelled to hold up to scorn and ridicule. I enjoyed that portion of his articles thoroughly and agree that he gave to those straddlers in political economy and metaphysical history all that was coming to them.

But when Comrade Boudin ventures into the deep waters of the more abstruse and complicated Marxian analyses, especially those of *Capital*, volume III, he gives evidence of insufficient preparation and hasty reading. Here true and false are almost inextricably mixed up by him, and the confusion created by the critics whom he scourges is worse confounded by his own attempts to straighten it out. What Boudin in reality presents on this subject, is a theory of his own, not that applied by Marx in volume III to the theory of competition.

It is an endless task, this struggle against the confusion created by friend and foe in the realms of Marxian ideas, this critique of the critical critique of critics of latter-day Marxian critics, this sailing over an ever-swelling ocean of literature good for nothing but the waste basket, but which we are nevertheless compelled to read and refute on account of the flourish of trumpets with which such handiwork is announced and the pretensions with which it stalks about. And it is so much more disagreeable, when the author of such a confusion has the ability to do better and is young enough to do a little more studying before he ventures into the lime-light. But it is a task which must not be shirked, however tedious and thankless it may be, for it is not the literary fame of a few authors that is at stake, but the theoretical education of the membership of the Socialist party.

Luckily I can be brief, at least brief compared to the amount of ground covered by Boudin which requires new ploughing. My purpose is not to give an exhaustive review of Comrade Boudin's articles — at least not yet — but merely to prevent the spread of false notions concerning the crowning outcome of Marx's great work. And if I can show to the readers of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW that Boudin is untrustworthy in this one respect, they will be forewarned and will take his future work with a pinch of salt.

A few simple comparisons will show at a glance the deep chasm which yawns between Marx's own position and Boudin's conception and interpretation of it. Let us take a dive into that "system of economic contradictions," which Boudin has spread out before us, and let us try to untie some of his knotted webs.

In the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, February, 1906, Boudin undertakes to discuss the "Great Contradiction in the Marxian Theory of Value," namely, the contradiction between the labor-theory of value expounded by Marx in volume I of his *Capital* and the fact of an average rate of profit for all capitals engaged in the process of capitalist production. Boudin assures us that he will "present the Marxian theory as stated by Marx," but that he has in store, for publication at a later time, "some matters which will, in his opinion, put the whole matter in a new light."

While waiting for the "new light," let us examine whether Boudin really presents the Marxian theory "as stated by Marx."

On page 481, I. S. R., Boudin takes issue with those "learned critics," who have been misled by the similarity of the terms *cost of production* and *price of production*. "Has the price of production anything to do with the cost of production?" he asks. And he proceeds to tell us that these two things look so much alike at first sight that the uninitiated may easily be deceived into believing that they are really alike; that Marx's price of production is, indeed, based on the cost of production, but that his cost of production is "determined by its value according to the labor-value theory, whereas the 'ordinary' cost of production has no such determining element." So far so good. But now, instead of giving us a further explanation of the difference between Marx's cost of production, the capitalist's cost-price, and Marx's price of production, instead of telling us whether Marx ever makes use of the capitalist's cost-price as well as of his own cost of production, Boudin rambles off into a vague lot of generalities about the formation of an average rate of profit, a question which is indeed very relevant to the question of the price of production, but about which Boudin has nothing very definite to tell until he gets back to the price of production on page 484 and informs us that it is a mistake to

assume that "the category of the price of production is an innovation introduced by Marx in the third volume in an effort to solve the contradiction between the law of value and the law of equal return." It is true, he says, that "the *term* price of production is first used in the third volume," but "the principle itself is contained in the earlier volumes and has absolutely nothing to do with the particular problem presented by the question of the equal rate of profits. When Marx came to treat of that problem he simply applied to it a category which already was part of his system as expounded by him in the first and second volumes. The only difference between the category of price of production as used in the first and second volumes and as used in the third volume is this: The conditions for the formation of this price discussed in the first two volumes were such as made it always below the value of commodities, whereas the conditions for its formation discussed in the third volume make it possible for the price of production to be either below or above the value of the commodity. But whether above or below the value, whether formed by reason of the average rate of profit, or under the conditions described in the first and second volumes, or both, the price of production is governed by the value of the commodity, and exists by reason thereof and in conformity thereto."

In other words, this is Boudin's position: The price of production as used in the third volume, and the cost of production, or price of production, alleged to have been used in the earlier volumes, means essentially the same thing, only applied to different conditions. The price of production has nothing to do with the formation of the average rate of profit, for it can be formed without this rate. So far as the price of production differs from the "ordinary" cost of production, or cost price, it is merely a difference between Marx's cost of production based on labor-value and capitalist cost based on heaven knows what. That is all. And this is presenting the Marxian theory "as stated by Marx," according to Boudin.

Let us first see what Marx says.

"In volume I and II we were dealing only with the *values* of commodities. Now there has become detached from this value on the one hand, as one of its part, the *cost-price*, and on the other hand there has developed, as a changed form of value, the *price of production* of commodities." (Volume III, book I, p. 142.)

Are this cost-price, and this price of production, so little different from the principles mentioned in the first two volumes, and from the capitalist idea of these things, as Boudin asserts in his above presentation "as stated by Marx"? Has the particular problem presented by the question of the equal rate of profits nothing to do with the formation of the price of production, or

the price of production nothing to do with the problem of the average rate of profit? Does Marx state that?

"What a commodity costs the capitalist, and what the production of a commodity actually costs, are indeed two entirely different things.... Since on the basis of capitalist production the laborer himself, after his entry into the process of production, becomes an ingredient of the productive capital performing its function and belonging to the capitalist, so that the capitalist is the actual producer of commodities, the cost-price of commodities assumes for the capitalist the aspect of the actual cost of the commodity itself.....The capitalist cost of a commodity is measured by the expenditure of *capital*, the actual cost of a commodity by the expenditure of *labor*." (*Volume III, book I, p. 2.*)..... "the category of *cost-price* has nothing to do with the formation of the value of commodities, or with the self-expansion of capital.....But the analysis will show that the *cost-price* in capitalist economy assumes the false aspect of a category in the very production of values." (*Ibidem, p. 3.*) "In the *cost-price* the distinction between variable and constant capital is obliterated for the capitalist." (*Ibidem, p. 132.*) "Originally it had been assumed that the *cost-price* of a commodity is equal to the *value* of the commodities consumed in its production. But the *price of production* of a certain commodity constitutes its *cost-price* for its buyer, and so it may pass as a *cost-price* into the formation of the price of some other commodity. Since the *price of production* may vary from the *value* of a commodity, it follows that the *cost-price* of a commodity containing the price of production may stand above or below that portion of its total value, which is formed by the value of the means of production entering into it. It is necessary to remember this modified meaning of the *cost-price* and to keep in mind that there is always the possibility of a mistake, if in any particular sphere of production the *cost-price* of a commodity is assumed to be equal to the value of the means of production consumed in its production. But for the exigencies of the present analysis it is not necessary to enlarge on this point. Here the statement always remains correct that the *cost-price of commodities is always smaller than their value*. For no matter how much the *cost-price* of a commodity may differ from the value of the means of production consumed by it, the error of the past is immaterial for the capitalist. The *cost-price of a commodity is given, it is a premise independent of the production of that particular capitalist*, while the result of his production is a commodity containing a surplus-value, that is an excess in value over the cost-price. For the rest the rule that the *cost-price is smaller than the value of a commodity has now become transformed into the practical rule that the cost-price is smaller than the price of production*. So far as the total social capital is concerned, where the price of production is equal to the value, this rule is identical with the former one that the *cost-price is smaller than the value*. Although this rule is departed from in the individual spheres of production, it is still based on the fact that from the point of view of the total social capital, the *cost-price of the commodities produced by this total capital is smaller than their value, or smaller than the price of production, which, in the case of the total social capital, is identical with their value*. The *cost-price of a commodity refers only to the quantity of paid labor contained in it, the value refers to the total quantity of paid and unpaid labor contained in it, and the price of production refers to the quantity of the paid labor plus a certain quantity of unpaid labor determined independently of any individual sphere.*" (*Ibidem, p. 143-144.*)

So much is already evident from this presentation of the

case "as stated by Marx," that Marx makes a very careful distinction in terms and definitions, while Boudin applies a term, purposely introduced by Marx for reasons of his own in volume III, to a category in volume I and II. Marx uses no category of *price of production* in volume I and II, while Boudin applies this term to what he claims is the same principle in all three volumes. A very peculiar way of presenting Marxian theories "as stated by Marx"! It is furthermore evident, from Marx's own statements, that not only the *price of production* may be based on the *cost-price*, but also the *cost-price* on the *price of production*. This principle, which Marx, according to Boudin, carried over from the earlier volumes and applied to different conditions discussed in the third volume, is not the *price of production*, as Boudin says, but the *cost-price*, as Marx says. Marx states that in the earlier volumes (and, as a matter of fact, up to and including chapter VIII, volume III) he had always assumed that the *cost-price* was equal to the value of the *paid labor*, in other words, was *below* the value of the *paid plus unpaid labor*, while now, in the third volume, it may eventually be *above* or *below* the value of the *paid labor* in the case that the price of production of one commodity enters as a *cost-price* into the value of another. But nevertheless, says Marx, it still remains true, that the *cost-price* will always be *below* the value of the *paid plus unpaid labor*, or at least *below* the *price of production* where value assumes this changed form, and the *price of production* will be *equal* to the value of the *paid plus unpaid labor* in the case of the total social capital and in spheres of production with the same organic composition of capitals as the total social capital. Boudin, disagreeing with Marx, tells us that in the third volume, the *price of production*, the thing which Marx calls *cost-price* and carried over from the earlier volumes, may be either *above* or *below* the value of the *paid plus unpaid labor*. Marx says distinctly, that the *cost-price* always remains *below* the value of the *paid plus unpaid labor*, or at least *below* the *price of production*, and that the *price of production* fluctuates around the value of the *paid plus unpaid labor* in spheres with other than an average composition of capital, whereas Boudin confounds cost-price and price of production and hopelessly muddles Marx's clear statement of the case. Marx shows that the price of production is not only a new term, but also a new category, and Boudin says it is simply a new name for an old thing.

We shall presently see that Marx did not introduce merely this new *price of production* in volume III, but also a *market-value* and a *market-price*, and that all three have a very important role to play in connection with the average rate of profit.

True, Marx did not introduce the price of production as a makeshift in his embarrassment over the so-called great contra-

diction between his theory of labor-value and the fact of an average rate of profit, nor to explain by means of it the genesis of the average rate of profit, but because the average rate of profit is the *principal cause* of the price of production.

Boudin is quite right, the price of production is not necessary for the explanation of the rise of an average rate of profit except in a secondary way. But the average rate of profit has everything to do with the formation of the price of production. On the other hand, the *cost-price*, this principle which Marx carries over into the third volume, and which Boudin persists in calling price of production, has a whole lot to do with the formation of an average rate of profit, Boudin's contrary assertion notwithstanding. But it has nothing to do with the formation of value and surplus-value. At least Marx says so. *Boudin's presentation does not present the matter as stated by Marx.* That is the first result of our comparison.

Boudin has not scorn enough in his dictionary for the "careless use of terms for which *all* Marx critics are well noted." (*I. S. R.*, p. 415.) And these critics surely deserve all that is coming to them. But it would be still better, especially for the reputation of the Marx defenders, if *some* of these would first see the beam in their own eye before bothering about the mote in the eye of another. Incidentally we begin to feel a vague interest at this point in the promised "new light," and we wonder whether it will be akin to that shed by Boudin above.

Boudin, in his alleged presentation of the Marxian theory "as stated by Marx," asserts that the price of production may be formed under the conditions discussed in volumes I and II, that is, without the existence of an average rate of profit. Marx, speaking for himself, says:

"The prices which arise by drawing the average of the different rates of profit in the different spheres of production and adding this average to the cost-price of different spheres of production, are the *prices of production*. They are based on the existence of an average rate of profit, and this again, requires that the rates of profit in each individual sphere of production should have been reduced to so many average rates." (*Volume III, book I, p. 135.*) "Competition first brings about, in a certain individual sphere, the establishment of an *equal market-value and market-price* by averaging the *individual values* of commodities. The competition of capitals in the different spheres then results in the *price of production* which regulates the rates of profit between the different spheres." (*Ibidem, p. 159.*)

In other words, first an average rate of profit in the individual spheres, which leads to an average rate of profit in society by competition, establishes the prices of production, and leads to a mutual regulation of the one by the other.

Not only is the price of production a different theoretical category from the cost-price, and from the labor-cost, but it also

requires a different development of capitalist production. "The values of commodities must be considered theoretically as well as historically as prior to the prices of production." (Ibidem, p 156.) The prices of production imply a deviation from the labor-value to the extent that capitalist development advances. (Ibidem.)

It is true, Marx did not invent the price of production. He says himself that "it is actually the same thing which Adam Smith calls natural price, Ricardo price of production or cost of production, the physiocrats *prix nécessaire*. But not one of them revealed the difference between price of production and value," any more, let us add, than Boudin revealed the difference between labor-cost, price of production, and cost-price. There is at least some excuse for Adam Smith, Ricardo, and the physiocrats. Nobody showed it to them. But Boudin could not even explain it after it had been shown to him. He was very close to it, almost hot, for instance on pages 473 and 474 of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, where he almost explained it to the Marx critics. But only almost, not quite. And aside from this, there is always the essential difference between Marx and him, that Marx considers the price of production as a final effect, while Boudin talks as though it were the cause. Marx shows it to be a final effect, which becomes a reacting cause only in a secondary way, while Boudin talks as though the price of production were prior to the average rate of profit and at the same time denies that the two are fundamentally related.

Boudin consequently gets inextricably entangled in his own contradictions. Instead of explaining the formation of the price of production, he denies that the Marxian theory of value can explain, or be even "a guide to the actual prices paid for commodities. But a theory of value need not show that, and, as a matter of fact, could not. It would not be a theory of value if it did." (P. 421, I. S. R.) When I read that I naturally looked for some other explanation, or at least some quibble about theory of value, theory of surplus-value, theory of prices, or theory of competition, by which he would try to escape out of this *cul de sac*. But no. So I could only say: "Good-bye, Marx, with your theory of value which explains the formation of the actual prices paid for commodities!" For it does, even if Boudin's presentation "as stated by Marx" denies it. In volume III, book I, Marx wrote the following title of chapter IX. Let me whisper it into your ear: "*The Formation of an Average Rate of Profit and the Transformation of the Value of Commodities Into Prices of Production.*" (P. 132.)

In this chapter, and in chapter X, Marx tells us plainly what I have in part quoted above, namely, the relation between the value of commodities, the average rate of profit, and the forma-

tion of prices of production. And in carrying this out logically, Marx merely adhered to his original plan as outlined in his *Critique of Political Economy*, in 1859, and even there he indicates in a general way that labor-value, if taken from the sphere of production to the sphere of circulation, turns from a *time-measure of value* into a *money-standard of price*.

However, Boudin will have nothing to do with this explanation. According to him, always presenting the Marxian theories "as stated by Marx," value is determined by social conditions, while price is determined by individual valuation. "Value being the cause of price, the chief motive of the individual making the price will, of course, be the value of the thing priced. This does not mean, however, the actual value of the thing, but his idea of its value." (*I. S. R.*, p. 169.) At the same time he quotes with approval the statement of Marx that capitals in spheres of higher than average composition sell their commodities above their value, and capitals in spheres of lower composition below their value, supremely unconscious of the fact that his "idea" of price of production cannot explain this, and that this statement contradicts his determination of prices "by individual valuation," as opposed to the determination of values "by social conditions." As though one of Marx's great accomplishments had not been to do away with the clash between individual and social interpretation!

Marx shows throughout his three volumes that price is quite as much determined by social conditions as value, and that value is as much an individual product as price. He repeats again and again, that the actual condition of things appears inverted through the capitalist point of view. And Boudin repeats it after him, but quickly forgets all about it, after he has instructed the Marx critics. Marx dwells again and again on the fact that the capitalist does not care a snap about the use-value of his commodities, and does not know a thing about the nature and quantity of the value (paid and unpaid) contained in them, and Boudin repeats that. But that does not prevent Boudin from forgetting all about it and asserting that the "merchant pays his price to the manufacturer *knowing that the full surplus-value contained in the commodity has not yet been realized* and expecting to realize a further share thereof for his own benefit upon the resale of the commodity to the retailer or the consumer." (*I. S. R.*, p. 224.)

Marx emphasizes repeatedly, that the capitalist thinks he is selling his commodities *above* their value by adding his profit to what he considers their cost-price, and almost the whole third volume is devoted to an explanation of the way in which this capitalist illusion plays its pranks. The entire second volume of *Capital* is devoted to an analysis of the role of money in the cir-

culatation, in other words, to the role of a social commodity in the transformation of other commodities, as a preparation for the final illustration in volume III showing the transformation of value into price. And Boudin himself, in spite of his assertion that the theory of value cannot explain this, makes some desultory attempts to explain it by means of statements of Marx based on that theory. But of course Boudin cannot explain it, for the only theory that *does* explain it is Marx's theory of value. He has not understood Marx's price of production, and so he escapes by the easy expedient of repudiating the Marxian theory of value as a means of explanation and leaving it to the individual opinion of persons knowing nothing whatever of the nature or amount of the social labor-value contained in the commodities to fix prices according to the "individual estimation" of their "idea" of what that value may be. And that in the name of Marx!

I should like to have an explanation from Boudin, how a theory of surplus-value which "must explain the development of profits" (*I. S. R.*, p. 466) can do so without explaining the genesis of value and prices, and how a theory which is to "attain the principal object of political economy, the discovery of the laws governing the production and distribution of profits in the capitalist system," (*I. S. R.*, p. 482), and which "has to record its greatest triumph" (*I. S. R.*, p. 466) in that field, can accomplish this without explaining the transformation of value and surplus-value into prices. Will the "new light" explain that?

Boudin finally loses all patience and repudiates not only the Marxian theory of value and surplus-value, but also the Marxian historical materialism, in the following brilliant passage, which might have been written by the most frenzied champion of *absolute freedom*:

"The profit sharing of the capitalists is.....*absolutely* impersonal. It also requires *absolute freedom of movement* for the different elements which go into the progress of production and distribution. Wherever there is no *absolute freedom of movement*, the laws governing the division of surplus-value among the different capitalists are interfered with *arbitrarily* and may even be *abrogated*. This is a necessary corollary to the observation already made that all the laws of value and consequently the production and realization of surplus-value require *absolute freedom of movement*." (*I. S. R.*, p. 224.)

What a muddle! The laws of value and surplus-value, which, remember, do *not* explain the formation of prices, according to Boudin, must have *absolute freedom* of movement, if the capitalists are to share *impersonally* in profits through prices which they fix themselves by *individual estimation* of a value that has nothing to do with the *actual prices paid for commodities*! Make that into a rhyme, will you! And such a hash is served

up to us in the name of greater clearness of thought, and in the name of a theory which teaches the relativity of all things!

So far as there is any meaning in this gem of Boudin's mind, it says just the reverse of what Marx states. For Marx says that the profit sharing of the capitalists by means of an average rate of profit takes place to the extent that the law of value *is* abrogated, and Boudin says that it takes place only so long as the laws of value and surplus-value have *absolute freedom of movement*. What Boudin probably had in mind was the simple truth that the Marxian analyses apply strictly to a stage of capitalist production in which "free" competition is still in full swing, unimpaired by any "monopoly."

Let us see what Marx thinks of the "individual estimation" of prices, of the *absolute freedom*, and the relation of the average rate of profit to value and prices.

"The particular rates of profit in each sphere of production..... must be developed out of the value of commodities. Without such a development the average rate of profit (and consequently the price of production of commodities) *remains a concept without sense and meaning*. The price of production of commodities, then, is equal to their cost-price plus that percentage of profit which is added by means of the average rate of profit, or equal to the cost-price plus the average profit." (*Volume III, book I, p. 136.*) "If a capitalist sells his commodities at their prices of production, he recovers money in proportion to the value of the capital *consumed* by him in production and realizes profits in proportion to the capital *invested* by him in its capacity as a mere aliquot part of the total social capital. His cost-prices are specific. The addition of profit to these cost-prices is independent of his particular sphere of production, is a simple average per 100 of the invested capital." (*Ibidem, p. 137.*) "Since the total value of commodities regulates the total surplus-value, and this in turn regulates the level of the average profit and consequently that of the average rate of profit—considering this rate as a general law, or as the controlling element of fluctuations—it follows that the law of value regulates the prices of production." (*Ibidem, p. 159.*) "Under the entire capitalist system of production, it is always but in a very complicated and approximative way, as a never ascertainable average of incessant fluctuations, that the general law is enforced as the controlling tendency." (*Ibidem, p. 140.*)..... "That side of competition, which is momentarily the weaker, is also that in which the individual acts independently of the mass of his competitors and often works against them..... While the strongest side always acts more or less unitedly against its antagonist..... If one side has the advantage, every one belonging to it gains. It is as though they had exerted their common monopoly. If one side is the weaker, then every one may try on his own hook to be the stronger, or at least to get off as easily as possible, and in that case he does not care in the least for his neighbor, although his actions affect not only himself, but also all his fellow strugglers." (*Ibidem, p. 173-74.*)

Compare these simple, clear, and direct statements of Marx with the involved, muddled, and gushing phraseology of Boudin, and you will agree with me that at this point we should again feel vaguely interested in Boudin's promised "new light." I fear that it will be "the light that failed."

I said that the above passage of Boudin was a repudiation of Marx's historical materialism. For it is quite in line with Boudin's assertion that this is "not a theory explaining the motives which actuate individuals to act, but a historical theory explaining the motive powers which bring about those actions of the masses, the aggregate of which make up what we call history."

As a matter of fact, individual actions can be, and must be, explained by historical materialism in the same way as mass actions. Every individual action is more or less of a mass action, and every mass action is the action of individuals. There is no clash between these two. That is one of the first things which historical materialism teaches. True, in its strict form as a theory of human history it does not explain *all* individual actions, and it cannot explain any actions at all *by itself* and must call in the help of Dietzgen's elaborated theory, which Marx and Engels both endorsed. But Boudin is simply shirking an issue by denying that individual actions cannot be explained by historical materialism. It is simply another case of *not* representing the Marxian theory as stated by Marx.

Marx himself showed beautifully in volume III how individual and mass action blend in bringing about a reconciliation of his theory of value with the apparently contradictory fact of an average rate of profit and a tendency of this rate to fall. Boudin fills a whole volume of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW with his meditations on so-called great contradictions of Marx invented by Marx critics, but he does not explain matters "as stated by Marx," and as a result of his failure to so state the case, we have as the only palpable fact of his efforts the "great contradiction in Boudin's theory of value and surplus-value" and a promise for "new light."

Boudin started out to "restate the Marxian theory in the light of this new criticism, examining the objections raised with a view to determining whether and how far this criticism has led, or must needs lead, to a revision, modification, or abandonment of any of the subsidiary or tributary theories of Karl Marx; and whether such revision, modification, or abandonment, if any be necessary, affects the Marxian system as a whole."

A noble task indeed. A task too great for any one man, even with a lifetime of study and experience. A task which must be the work of evolution itself, not that of any one philosopher. A task that is as endless as the history of Marxism itself. A task toward which one man may contribute here and there, but which will never be completed, until Marxism shall be a thing of the past.

Boudin tells us that the Marx critics "are not a bit abashed when they are shown by quotations from Marx that he thought

just the other way." (I. S. R., p. 13.) Let us hope that he will not be like them, and that the first "new light" that comes to him will be used for his own enlightenment on a theory about which he is still very much in the dark. ERNEST UNTERMANN.

[A reply from Comrade Boudin will appear in the September REVIEW.—*Editor.*]

POOR MAN'S EUCHRE.

Every man has a hand in the game;
 Every man has a chance, so they say;
 The poor and the humble oft rise into fame;—
 Why, fortunes are made in a day!

Aye, fortunes of millions are made;
 But if you will watch and keep check,
 You will see that more aces are played
 Than the aces there are in the deck.

Something's wrong with a game that is played
 So that luck runs only one way.
 That's the reason that millions are made,
 And millions are lost in the play.

Poor men's savings all go in the pot;
 There's a wink and a nudge, or a beck;
 There's something not right there, I wot,—
 Some dealing from under the deck.

The poor cannot quite understand
 The cards that are marked on the back,
 Or know how to deal slight o' hand,
 Or to cut and shuffle the pack.

Of this game they do not understand
 The poor will grow weary some day;
 They'll make a rough house, and demand
 That there be a fair deal in the play.

P. Q.

Author of "The World, Was Made That Way," and other things.

Sympathizin' of Mrs. Deacon Smith.

The new schoolmarm an' Rose Merrill had come over to spend the afternoon. Now I like the new schoolmarm and I like Rose Merrill (and so does Noah) an' I enjoyed visitin' with 'em (an' so would Noah, if he'd bin at home, which he wasn't, havin' gone off right soon after dinner to take a load of turnips to Nanceville). An' we wus gettin' right confidential an' havin' heart to heart talks, as you might say, when we heard the front gate click, an', surmisin' in my mind that some one wus comin', I looked out at the winder an' see Mrs. Deacon Smith a-comin' up the walk. I see she wus come fer a formal call, fer she wus dressed elegant in her meetin' bunnit an' umbrell' an' her secon' best black alpacky. It's a good piece of goods, that alpacky is, an' havin' bin wore only five year an' turned onct it's good as new, an' it would be her meeting' dress till now only her brother that's out West sent her a new one fer Christmas this year back.

Wal, as I wus sayin' when I see Mrs. Deacon Smith comin' up the walk, I felt in my bones that she wus a comin' on bizness of some sort — onpleasant bizness. An' they wus right — my bones wus.

She rustled into the settin' room an' sot down in the best rocker. Mrs. Deacon Smith don't wear silk petticoats, but ever since the Deacon kep' store over to Nanceville an' she lived in town a spell she rustles powerful. They do say she bastes newspapers into her skirt linin's, but I don't know as it's so, an' ortn't to repeat hearsay. She has a different air, too, since she lived in Nanceville — a sort of stiff an' starched air. There is them that admires it.

Wal, after we hed discussed the weather an' the crops an' the state of health of our respective families, she opened her mouth an' shet it agin, an' coffered a little, an' opened it again. An' I felt in my bones it wus comin'.

An' sez she, "I've been a thinkin' I'l have my name took off of that club that wus organized a Sat'dy." Sez she, "As the wife of a Deacon, a pillar in the church an' a respectable member of the community, I have my position in society to maintain."

An' I sez, "Wal, what uv that?" Sez I, "What has that got to do with the club that wus organized a Sat'dy?"

An' sez she, "I don't believe in agitatin' sech questions." Sez she, "When the Deacon use to keep store in Nanceville I

hed a opportunity to observe the lower orders, an' they are gettin' all they earn, an' ortn't to be agitated."

An' sez I, "Ef they're gettin' all they earn, how comes it that other folks that never did a lick of work in their lives is rollin' in luxury an' has money to throw at birds?" Sez I, "Ef one man has got a dollar he hain't earnt, some other man has earnt a dollar he hain't got. There ain't no way of gettin' around that," sez I.

An' sez she, "Them wage workin' folks would all be fixed comfortable ef they would pay their debts an' save their money. When the Deacon kep' store at Nanceville," sez she, "there was folks owin' him year in an' year out" (the Deacon kep' store jest eighteen months to my certain knowledge) "an' they didn't try to pay him." Sez she, "They'd go in debt fer pink hair ribbon an' Christmas presents."

An' sez I, "If there's any reason why poor men's children ortn't to have Christmas presents, then," sez I, "nobody ort to have 'em." Sez I, "The children that's born in a manger or hovel has the best claim to Christmas joys." An' sez I, "When we who build costly churches to honor the lowly carpenter's son while his little ones is shelterless, when we," sez I, "learn to fol-ler His teachin's there won't be any little disinherited children whose folks have to go in debt fer Christmas presents fer 'em."

An' sez she, "They wouldn't need to go in debt ef they'd work an' economize. They're jest shiftless," sez she, "an' lazy, too."

Now I believe in economy, but I don't believe in stintin' an' skimpin' an' wearin' all the gray matter out'n your brain tryin' to save fifteen cents. I do skim, good land, yes, but I do it from necessity, not from principle. Mrs. Deacon Smith skimps, too, but she don't know it. She's done it so long it's secon' natur'.

But I sez, real calm an' peacefyin', sez I, "Of course there is shiftless folks, piles of 'em, an' there is lazy folks who don't want to do nothin', but," sez I "is that any reason why folks that's willin' to work ortn't to have the chance to work an' to get all they produce?"

An' sez she, "There's chances for everybody that wants 'em. It's a free country," sez she, "an' there's ekal opportunities fer all." Sez she, "When Deacon kep' store in Nanceville I see lots of young folks come in from the country an' work their way through the Nanceville Academy. Young folks that hed nothin' but their two hands an' grit. Anybody that wants a eddycation can get it. An'," sez she, warmin' to the subject as she proceeded farther away from it, "I took a girl myself right into my home an' let her work for her board. She done the housework nights an' mornin's, an' come back from the

Academy at eleven every day an' got dinner. She never fooled away no time on parties an' beaux an' pink hair ribbons. An' she did the family washin' a Sat'dys. An' she stood head of her classes, too, every one on 'em."

"Where is she now," asked the schoolmarm.

"Oh, she's dead now," sez Mrs. Deacon Smith. "She went to college an' took nervous prostration."

An' sez I, "When my little Grace Keziah an' Belle Almedy goes to Nanceville Academy they shall not work theirselves to death an' they shall have all the innocent pleasures other young folks has, if I have to work my fingers to the bone to get 'em fer 'em." Sez I, "When you rob a child of its play time, you rob it of its life."

An sez Mrs. Deacon Smith, "It's wrong fer parents to sacrifice theirselves that away fer their children."

An' sez I, "It's wrong, root an' branch, the *system* is, that demands the slaughter of the innosents or the sacrifice of the parents an'," sez I, "it won't be my innosents that's slaughtered — not while I'm a-livin'."

An' Mrs. Deacon Smith sez, "It's a well-known fack," sez she, "I've often read it in the papers, an' my observations in Nanceville, when the Deacon kep' store there, confirms it, that the young folks that works their own way through school gets higher marks and stands head more than them that takes life easier."

An' sez I, "It is a well-known fack that them that's heads of school classes don't make their mark in the world after leavin' school nigh so often as them below 'em."

But sez she, "Poverty is a incentive. You can't deny it. Poverty is a great incentive."

"A incentive to what?" sez I. "A incentive to work till you drop in' the harness or leastways till you drop out'n the race and let them that's hed a better opportunity go on an' win?"

An' sez she, "Poverty is a incentive to strugglin'. It develops folks." Sez she, "Our grate statesmen an' jinerals an' sech grow from poor country boys."

"They do," sez I, "a power on 'em does, but it ain't poverty that makes 'em grate. It's pure country air an' outdoor exercise while they're a growin'. It's good, wholesome vittles an' plenty of 'em." An, sez I, "for I'd thought on that subjeck, bein' the mother of a country boy myself," sez I, "the reason why country boys win in the race for statesmanships, jineralships, flagships, an' sech things, is that they've got good, healthy, stout brains in healthy bodies." Sez I, "Ef it's poverty that makes folks grate why hain't grate men riz up out of the slums of big cities? Ef you can find poverty anywhere it's in them slums," sez I, "an' it don't develop 'em; it degrades 'em."

An' I looked at the schoolmarm an' sez I, "Ain't that true?"

An' she sez, "It is." An' she quoted Henry George, who wus a good man, an' he'd studied these things. (He wasn't quite a Socialist, Henry George wusn't, but from all I can hear, he wus not far from the kingdom). An' the schoolmarm sez Henry George says that in one class of slum folks in New York "the birth of a boy an' a girl means another man for the penitentiary, and another girl for the brothel."

An' sez I, "Think on't, innozent, unborn babies condemned to such lives beforehand; think on't."

An' sez Mrs. Deacon Smith, "It's foreordination."

An' sez I, "Foreordination, fiddlesticks."

It was not a perlit thing to say, but it does rile me so to hear folks layin' all the meanness of men onto the Lord. All the shortsightedness of 'em an' the ignorance of 'em an' the general cussedness of 'em. So I jest said to Mrs. Deacon Smith, sez I, "Foreordination, fiddlesticks."

An' Mrs. Deacon Smith riz up to go, an' she helt out her hand to me to say goodby. An' she sez in the lofty an' patronizin' manner born of the fack thet the Deacon use to keep store at Nanceville, sez she, "I know your intentions is good," an' sez she, "I myself hev a great deal of sympathy fer the workin' class." An' I meanwhile an' mechanikally hed put out my hand and grasped her'n, an' the hard callus spots in her palm rubbed agin the hard callus spots in mine, an' sez I, "Workin' class," sez I, "Ef you an' me ain't workin' class what in the livin' earth be we?"

An' she flushed up real resentful an' she drew her hand back an' begun a puttin' on her gloves. They wus her meetin' gloves, lisle thread, an' they wus darned. Mrs. Deacon Smith is a master hand at darnin'; ef she wusn't them gloves wouldn't a helt together as they hev.

An' sez she, "I wus speakin' 'of wage workers," sez she, "who hev nothin'."

She brought out the last words real contemptuous. Funny, ain't it, how folks who hev nothin' is allus objects of contempt, especially to some thet hev mighty little.

But sez I, real calm an' peacefyin', sez I, "There wus a wage worker, an' he wus a revolutionary wage worker, too — a stirrin' up of the people," an' sez I, "he chose his most bosom friends from the workin' class — fisher men an' sech."

An' sez she, "That wus diffrent. In them days the people wus conquered by the Romans and couldn't help theirselves."

An' sez I, "In these days the people is conquered by the capitalists an' can't help theirselves." ("Except," sez the school-

marm soty vocey, "at the ballot box. They can help themselves to the earth and the fullness thereof at the ballot box.")

An' Mrs. Deacon Smith went on an', sez she, "There ain't no manner of use fer their bein' conquered by no capitalist. Why don't they move out into the country," sez she, "an' hev peace an' plenty?" She spoke them words real lofty, especially the last word "plenty." You'd a thought she never in her life had a-skimped and squeezed on a dollar to make it do the work of two. An' she made a gestur, a real lofty gestur, but in makin' it she dropped one of her gloves an' the schoolmarm picked it up an' handed it to her. An' the schoolmarm's face wus real sober. It wus the worst darned glove of the two, but the schoolmarm turned it over as she picked it up so the biggest darns wus on the under side as she handed it back, which wus real considerate, too. The schoolmarm has a pink an' white face, like a peach blossom in the spring, an' the corners of her mouth has dimples tucked in all around when she smiles. An' as she stooped over to get the glove I ketched a glimpse of her dimples appearin' on the side of her face thet wus next to me, but when she riz up an' give back the glove her face wus sober as a judge. You couldn't a-told there hed ever been any dimples within a mile of her.

An' Mrs. Deacon Smith went on, an' sez she, "Ef they'd move out into the country, where they could work nights an' mornin's, instid of workin' ten hours a day an' idlin' away the rest of their time in the saloons, they could live like WE do."

An' she rustled out of the sittin' room an' down the walk a trailin' her alpacky skirt. When I shet to the door behind her, an' turned an' looked at the schoolmarm the dimples all broke loose an', bless her heart, I took her in my arms an' kissed them dimples like I kiss my own baby's dimples when I tickle his little pink toes to make him laugh. It's only bin a month sense I first saw the schoolmarm, but, land sakes, there's some folks you get acquainted with the first time you see 'em, an' you feel as ef you'd knowed 'em ever sense the foundations of the earth wus laid, if not sooner. The schoolmarm affected me that a-way. So, as I wus a-sayin', I kissed the schoolmarm's dimples an' I patted her on the shoulder, an' sez I to her, "Now, will you be good?" I don't use slang fer common, but that's a sayin' my Benjy picked up at school an' it struck me as kind of pat. So I sez to her, sez I, "Now, will you be good?"

An' the schoolmarm set down in a chair an' laughed. She laughed till the tears wus playin' hide an' seek in her dimples.

An' sez she, "It isn't funny, oh DEAR!" 'an' then she laughed some more. "It isn't funny," sez she, "it's TRAGIC, but, oh Aunt Betty, I can't help laughing."
An' no more could I.

From "The Rebel at Large," by May Beals.

How Much Longer ?

Did you hear the babies crying—
Crying for the want of bread?
Did you hear the women sighing
For the plenteous days long dead?
Bitter, bitter, are the tear drops
That the hungry children shed,—
And they strike our hearts like lead!

Did you see the workmen tramping
Past the fast-locked fact'ry door,
While the yellow sun rays, slanting,
Glide along the dusty floor?
Heavy, heavy, are their footsteps,—
Heavy are their hearts and sore!
Must they tramp forever more?

How much longer, O ye rulers,
Can you let the children cry?
How much longer, O ye masters,
Will you hear the women sigh?
How much longer, O ye *People*,
Must we watch the workers die?

GEO. E. WINKLER.

EDITORIAL

The Coming Campaign.

The congressional and state campaigns upon which the Socialist Party is just entering seem in many ways likely to duplicate the presidential campaign of two years ago in the great increase of socialist sentiment. It is scarcely necessary to point out how within the last year and a half socialism has invaded every field of thought and action,—has not only broken the "conspiracy of silence," but has made itself the principal topic in much of the literature of even its worst enemies.

The recent move of Gompers in the Trade Unions, his demand that organized labor should now enter politics, and his call for a "campaign fund," are all indications that the socialist sentiment is making itself felt. These indications also, especially when taken in connection with the literature of the Civic Federation and the emanations of William Randolph Hearst, show part of what has all the appearance of a wide-spread plot to side-track socialist sentiment. Gompers and Hearst have made an alliance, as shown by the recent editorials in the "Federationist" and the sudden cessation of the attacks on Gompers in the Hearst papers. The next step will undoubtedly be the attempt to place in the field "labor tickets" wherever there is any possibility of disrupting the socialist party.

Meantime Hearst keeps up a continuous campaign of lying against prominent socialists in the hope of bringing to his aid the anti-socialist Catholic church, or at least such portion of its membership as are inclined toward radicalism.

All this, however, must be extremely temporary in its effect. The great forces which are giving rise to the present socialist movement are too powerful and extensive to bear manipulation in this sort of ward-politics style.

If the Socialist Party is to meet this emergency and rise to the opportunity which present conditions are offering, the first necessity is a strong party organization. This is being steadily developed. The national office has more organizers in the field and a greater income from dues than it had in the midst of the last presidential campaign. It is for the socialists to decide whether the income for the campaign fund will reach an amount adequate to the tremendous demands that are being made upon the national organization. The National Committee has decided to employ a campaign manager who shall devote his entire time to the organization of the work of agitation.

After all the main work of the campaign will be done in the state

and local organizations. There are some states where the fight is of special significance. Colorado and Idaho at once come to mind in this connection. In nominating Comrade Haywood for governor, the socialists of Colorado have done one of those splendid striking things that sound the bugle call for action.

The national office is prepared to send several organizers into each of these two states during the campaign. From various other directions the activity in these states is receiving national support.

The socialists of Illinois are preparing to run a daily paper during the last two weeks of the campaign, which should mean much for the movement in that state. The trade unionists of several states have already replied to Gompers call for political action by declaring that the Socialist Party is a good enough labor party for them.

This general survey shows how encouraging is the outlook. With a proper effort the socialist vote this fall should place the United States well up in the foremost ranks of the International Socialist Army.

* * *

Seldom does a parliamentary speech rise to the importance of an international event, yet from the tributes which have been paid to it by both friend and foe there can be no doubt that the speech of Comrade Jaures in the French Chamber of Deputies a few weeks ago partakes of this character. The speech was delivered in response to a challenge to do something besides criticise. He sets forth the socialist position with a fullness and accuracy that makes it a valuable propaganda document even aside from the wonderful eloquence of form in which he closed his arguments.

The INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, in accordance with its custom, to present to its readers in the best possible form the events of international socialism, at once communicated with Comrade Jaures, asking him for a complete and accurate copy of his speech. This has just come to hand and will appear in our next number. This will make the September issue of special value for propaganda purposes as well as of more than ordinary interest to socialists. Those desiring extra copies must order them in advance as but few additional copies to those demanded by our subscribers are printed each month.

* * *

Comrade Hayes calls attention to one phase of the Gompers' political policy which deserves a further thought. This is the effect which the attempt to hang on to the tails of both political dogs, must have in disrupting the A. F. of L. It is perfectly true that "politics in the union" is a disrupting force, if "politics" is taken in the sense in which Gompers and Co. always use the word, i. e. capitalist politics.

This recent phase is but one additional sign of the process of disintegration, which those who founded the I. W. W. saw, or at least thought they saw, in the A. F. of L. If the I. W. W. at its coming convention proceeds to clear out the crowd of jaw-fighting disruptionists that followed De Leon into that organization, and becomes a bona-fide labor organization, such as is constituted by the Western Federation of Miners and some other branches of the organization, it will play the part which its founders intended it to play in the American labor movement. We believe that this will be done and that subsequent events will justify the foresight and judgment of those who have recently been so roundly denounced for their I. W. W. affiliations.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

RUSSIA.

The labor group in the Douma has issued the following manifesto: "On the 26th of May the government has sent its reply to the address of the Douma. You know comrades, laborers, what the Douma demanded. You know now how the government has answered.

"The Douma demanded amnesty—the government has refused it. The Douma demanded freedom of speech, of press, the right of strike, union and assembly, the inviolability of person, the abolition of the death penalty, of the state of war and siege—the government has rejected all of these.

"The Douma demanded universal suffrage—the government refused it.

"The Douma demanded that the crown lands and the lands of the cabinet, church, cloister and the great landlords should be transferred to the hands of the peasants—the government refused this. The government declared that it would not be permitted to interfere with private possession of land. The government promised no law for the benefit of the working class, that would better their miserable condition.

"After this reply to their demands the Douma unanimously voted its lack of confidence in the present ministry and demanded that a new ministry should be created of persons favorable to the program set forth in the reply of the Douma.

"Comrades, Workers! We, the labor representatives in the Douma have voted together with the whole Douma against the present government. Naturally the working class would add much to the demands which the Douma has made. Nevertheless there was much in the Douma address that is indispensable to the whole people and to the working class. Therefore we thought it to be our duty to protest with them.

"A conflict has arisen between the imperial Douma and the government, which sooner or later must end with the downfall of the government. But the cause of the people can only conquer when the whole people unite in the battle which the Douma has begun.

"Comrades, Workers! You now see that the Douma cannot help the people so long as the government robs it of all the rights of true popular representation. You see now that every good beginning of the Douma will be shattered on the personal domination of the government. This government is controlled by the great possessing classes of the country and these same people utilize our entire helplessness and all these exceptional laws (state of war and siege) in order to maintain the peasants and the laborers in slavery and subjection.

"These people, nobility, officials and higher clericals hold in their

hand the absolute domination of the country and prevent Russia from taking a single step on the road to freedom. A powerless Douma along side of a bureaucracy is not capable of meeting the demands of the people, but only a powerful constitutional government, based upon universal, direct and equal suffrage without distinction of religion, race, or sex can meet the problem. The surrender of all power to these representatives for the purpose of fighting is a duty at the present time of every citizen, and we, representatives of the working class, will energetically strive to prepare the Douma for the calling of such a constituent assembly.

"And you, comrades, workers, must also prepare yourselves to support the Douma in its conflict with the government and to defend your interests. Close up your ranks! Explain to the unconscious masses the conflict between the Douma and the government.

"Organize yourselves! Unite! Gather your powers, you will need them!

"Organize and unite without giving any provocation, without unnecessary conflict with the powers that be. Do not permit any proletarian blood to be shed unnecessarily.

"The most essential thing now is that all Russia, little and great, thoroughly understand the meaning of this conflict between the Douma and the government.

"At the same time express your innermost feelings, comrades, laborers. Adopt resolutions at your meetings and assemblies and send them to your representatives. We labor representatives need these as a support in our struggle against the government.

"Long live the union of the working class!

"Long live the power and the freedom of the people!"

Signed by the labor representatives of the Douma.

The dissolution of the Douma and the consequent momentary reaction has thrown matters in such confusion in Russia that it is impossible for us to give any news that would not be rendered ancient by the daily press almost as soon as the REVIEW would reach its readers. One thing is certain, however, and that is that the present is an extremely unstable stage. Yet socialists must be on their guard against expecting too quick action. About a year ago it was stated in these columns that it would probably be fully eighteen months before there would even be any definite lining up of the contending forces, and the present news brings no reason to shorten this period. The great size and composite population and the backward industrial conditions in Russia render any sudden action improbable, if not impossible. The most probable outlook at the present time would seem to be that there would be over six months to a year of skirmishing with terrorism on one side and judicial murders on the other, but with a steady growth of revolutionary sentiment and a steady weakening of the defences of bureaucracy.

SWITZERLAND.

Switzerland seems to be the only country in Europe that is in the full grasp of reaction. Nearly every proposal of radical action has been rejected, and recently the police of the city government of Zurich have lent their assistance to the Russian agents in the capture of Russian revo-

lutionists residing in that city. This violation of the traditional right of asylum, which has been so long maintained in Switzerland, may possibly prove the last straw that shall rouse the working class of Switzerland to what is being done. These events are especially interesting in view of the statements that are being circulated by some pseudo socialists in the United States to the effect that Switzerland is on the high road to socialism.

ENGLAND.

The work of educating the workers and especially the younger ones, is something with which the socialists of all countries are more and more occupying themselves. In England Ruskin College, located at Oxford, is receiving the support of the trade unions for this purpose. Engineers, railroad workers, weavers and some other trade unions contributed to its maintenance, as well as endowing one or more scholarships. In 1906 there were forty students in attendance, of which 35 were members of trade unions.

The principal subjects taught are sociology, evolution, logic, ethics, elocution, history of industry and social movements, administration, etc. Each student supported by the trade union is required to send a weekly report of his work to his union. The whole spirit of Ruskin College is socialistic, although it is not directly controlled by any socialist organization. A correspondence department has reached 6,500 students since its establishment.

GERMANY.

Steadily the German socialist movement grows in strength. This is shown by the elections, in the growth of party membership and the circulation of the press. For instance, at a recent election in Hamburg, the socialists elected their candidate by 31,000 votes against 30,596 for all the other candidates combined.

In the various municipal elections socialist gains are reported. In Hanover the first socialist has been sent to the municipal council. In Baden the socialists were successful in municipal elections in several cities. The congress of Schleswig-Holstein, which has just been held, reported that the membership had increased from 8,500 to 16,000 during the year past. This gain was in face of the fact that police prosecution had been much more rigorous than heretofore.

POLAND.

The Polish congress which met during the last of May at Lemburg showed a steady increase in all phases of activity. The party press has made great progress in spite of the fact that the total imprisonment of socialist editors during the year amounted to nearly forty years.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The new (or rather, the played-out and resurrected) political policy of "rewarding our friends and punishing our enemies" is to be given a practical test this and next month. Congressman Littlefield, of Maine, is to be made to feel the displeasure of President Gompers and his advisors in the A. F. of L. who subscribe to his methods of freeing the working class from the yoke of capitalism. Mr. Gompers has announced his intention of visiting Littlefield's district in person and taking charge of the campaign against that worthy. Not only will he make ten or twelve speeches, but it is reported that a score or more of A. F. of L. organizers will invade such industrial centers as Lewiston, Bath, Rockland, Vinal Haven and other places to appeal to the laboring people to turn down Littlefield. Stuart Reid, the A. F. of L.'s crack organizer, who has been up in Maine for several months ostensibly to unionize the clam diggers and lobster trappers, has been putting in some hard knocks against Littlefield. The notorious F. G. R. Gordon has also loomed up at Lewiston, although it is not quite clear who is paying him. Gordon was formerly a member of the Socialist Party, and when he knew not where to lay his head or secure the next meal the Haverhill comrades took him in, and "Jim" Carey housed, fed and clothed him. He displayed his gratitude by attempting to sow seeds of dissension in the party and even went so far as to butt into family relations. When the true character of the fellow was understood the atmosphere in and about Haverhill became very chilly for Mr. Gordon and he packed his box of collars and departed. Then he joined the Avery-Goldstein combine of "Childrenless Parents" fame and lined up with anybody and everybody who antagonized socialism and had a sandwich to give out. One day Gordon bobbed up in Haverhill and started a paper called the *Million*, which was said to have been subsidized by the late lamented Economic League, an organization into which a select few plutocrats were coaxed to furnish the graft to "smash socialism." Gordon did his share to defeat "Jim" Carey, the only man who fought in the Massachusetts Legislature for every bill introduced by the labor organizations of that state. He played the ingrate, the Judas, but without the decency to hang himself. When boodle ceased to be forthcoming the *Million* disappeared and Gordon dropped out of sight. Now he turns up in Maine and is attempting to disrupt the socialist movement in the interest of Gillicudy, the democratic candidate.

To support republicans in Massachusetts and democrats in Maine may be the true Gompsonian policy, but how any self-respecting citizen can hope to preserve a decent reputation by pursuing such tactics is past comprehension. That Littlefield is a cold-blooded plutocrat and deserves to be defeated no socialist will dispute, but there is nothing gained by jumping from the frying-pan into the fire. Political history of this country

proves that whenever democrats were needed to assist the privileged few whose interests are usually safeguarded by the republicans they were forthcoming. If the democrats in Congress were sincere friends of labor, as they have pretended to be for lo, these many years — even when the southern element claimed the right to own as well as rob human beings — why did they not demand from the floor of the House and Senate that the labor bill be reported. They could have blocked legislation every day in the week and kicked up such disturbances that the old fossilized Cannon, Littlefield, Grosvenor & Co. would have been forced to yield or go before the country unmasked as labor's inveterate enemies, which they are secretly. I wish to repeat what I have said before, and which must be patent to every trade unionist who stops to think, and that is, if we are to support republicans in one district and democrats in another as "friends of labor," ignoring the self-evident fact that both old parties uphold and defend capitalism and enforce rules of caucus, we shall not only continue to meet with disappointments, but, worse still, dissension and disruption is bound to spread through the ranks. The Knights of Labor disintegrated because they wasted time and effort in attempting to decide whether the pot was blacker than the kettle. Cheap skate boodlers and ward-healers crept in everywhere and for a time they fairly reveled in clover as they picked out this "good man" and that "enemy." Bitter debates were followed by physical encounters, and in more than one city that might be mentioned rival leagues and associations were formed to deliver the so-called labor vote. Certainly the non-political or neutral policy that has been pursued by the A. F. of L. ever since its inception was much more safe and sane than the present confusion that is becoming manifest in various parts of the country where capitalistic politics is being played by unionists. If Gompers and his lieutenants did not want to form a distinct labor party or join the socialist movement they should have kept their hands out of politics altogether. Gompers points to the success of the British trade unionist and tries to twist the methods they pursued as a sort of endorsement of his present policy. He overlooks the fact that as a rule the leading labor men in Great Britain refused to take the platform in favor of the capitalistic politicians of the Conservative and Liberal parties. Furthermore those laborites who were elected on the Liberal ticket are by no means the beau ideals of the British working class. As a matter of fact it is the independent group, the men of the Labor Representation Committee, the Independent Labor Party and Social Democratic Federation, whose chairman is J. Keir Hardie — that is most popular with the working people and wields the greatest influence in Parliament.

But to return to the Maine fight. When it was announced that the American Federation of Labor would flood the district with organizers and speakers, Littlefield declared in an interview that he welcomed their opposition, and that his constituents knew him and were not likely to be stampeded. It is further reported that Cannon and other big and little guns of the G. O. P. were to be imported to make speeches and that the National Association of Manufacturers and other labor-hating organizations and individuals stood ready to contribute unlimited funds "to teach the labor agitators a lesson." One of the best informed labor men in New England, who is a national executive and no socialist, by the way, said to me, in discussing the Maine situation a few days ago: "I am sincerely sorry that Gompers was so shortsighted as to go up into Maine to make a test with his political scheme. Littlefield owns his district outright. He has a majority behind him that is almost invulnerable, and then again he will attract the sympathy and support of every anti-unionist in his district and the whole country. If he is re-elected in September the present policy of labor in politics will be ridiculed from the Atlantic

to the Pacific and our people will become proportionately discouraged Gompers should have made his experiment in several close districts this fall, and where organized labor is stronger than in the little middle class towns of Maine. Even if he had unofficially spoken a few favorable words for your socialists, who seem to be increasing in numbers everywhere, he wouldn't have lost anything, for your party appears to be making gains in the face of all obstacles and is bound to make a big stride forward this year if signs of the times count for anything."

In addition to the fight that is to be waged against Littlefield many other prominent members of Congress are singled out for attack by Gompers and his friends. Among them are Speaker Cannon, Payne, the republican floor leader; Dalzell, of Pennsylvania; Charles Landis, of Indiana; Jenkins, of Wisconsin; Parker, of New Jersey. All of these gents were particularly conspicuous in sinking their knives into the eight-hour and anti-injunction bills. Old Grosvenor, of Ohio, who also did his share to block favorable legislation, after having posed as a "friend of labor" for a quarter of a century, being returned term after term from a mining district, has been retired by his own party, and now some other "friend" will do the humbugging as long as the miners stick to the grand old party. The political experiment will, of course, cost a pretty good bunch of money, but 'twill be worth it. Along in November Mr. Gompers and those who believe as he does, will know just about where they stand.

Meantime the socialist party will move along the even tenor of its way. The comrades in Maine intend to fight their battle against the field as they have always done. The same condition will exist in all districts throughout the country. The socialists are not monkeying around with capitalistic politicians, who are all alike, differing perhaps only in degree. The socialists don't intend to allow their party organization to go by the board just because some would-be Moses suddenly bobs up somewhere with some hair-brained scheme to prolong capitalistic exploitation for a mess of pottage. No labor political movement amounts to a hill of beans that does not accept the principles of socialism. This fact has been proven over and over again and only lately in California, where the so-called Union Labor party in San Francisco is in disintegration. Schmitz, Reuf & Co. were merely republicans in disguise and are handing out franchises and special privileges to their capitalistic masters just like other boodle politicians have done before them.

Judging from the manner in which union people throughout the country are discussing politics and taking action in favor of one plan or another the claims of the socialists, who have declared all along that the problems of labor must be solved ultimately at the ballot-box, are being vindicated. It is immaterial just at this juncture whether the great majority of the trade unionists affiliate with the socialist movement or strike out independently, or reward our friends and punish our enemies through the old parties. The point is that the old cry, "keep politics out of the union," has been muzzled, perhaps forever, thanks to the action of the A. F. of L. executive board, whether it was good, bad or indifferent. For years the socialists have been handicapped in their attempts to point out to their fellow-workers in local unions and national conventions the necessity of capturing the powers of government to overthrow capitalism, but now the bars are being leveled, politics is the order of the day and already overshadows industrial issues, locally at least. Now when the indifferent or former reactionary member rises in his seat and opines that we ought to stick together politically, carry our grievances to the ballot-box, question candidates, reward our friends and punish our enemies, the "red-but-

ton" brother can follow with his philosophy, and the one who has the logic, the information and plans that appeals to the common sense of the members will receive the sympathy and support sooner or later. The republican and democratic brethren may split hairs relating to the alleged friendliness or antagonism of their respective parties and candidates as much as they please, but it will be the socialist who will have plenty of ammunition to shoot both old parties to pieces and by appealing to reason will make excellent propaganda for the world's working class movement. Indeed, it will be the socialists alone who will, in reality, be able to save the trade unions from disruption, when the republican and democratic brethren start "rough house" as they did a generation ago, by uttering a plague upon both their houses. It will be the socialist party member, too, who will hold up to the ridicule and scorn of people possessing common sense the fallacy of workingmen pulling hair over the alleged merits of the A. F. of L. and I. W. W. in the purely industrial field endeavors. But the most encouraging feature of all is the fact, which is already being demonstrated and will become plainer in the future, that the political movement will get ahead of its leaders. The rank and file may go into the rewarding and punishing business for a campaign or two, they may even dally with so-called labor parties for a time, but the open shop fanatics and the widespread agitation started by "muck-rakers," as well as other political, economic and social developments of more or less importance, will cause the masses of organized men to gravitate toward the only political party that has a program and a goal that cannot be misunderstood. This is a golden opportunity for the socialists who are members of trade unions to arm themselves with bundles of literature and to break in as speakers and proselyte for their cause. Already in a number of places organized laboring men have made official announcements that show the drift and what has been accomplished. In St. Louis, for example, the central body discussed Gompers' call to go into politics at a representative special meeting and wound up by advising the membership to support the socialist party rather than play with the capitalistic parties or start a new movement. It is pretty certain that Milwaukee will stand pat for socialism, and it is likewise probable that no capitalistic politicians will be endorsed or a new party launched in Cleveland. In Chicago and New York independent movements have been endorsed by the central bodies, but strong minority factions are laboring to convert the workers to the socialist view of conditions. In many smaller places labor parties have been started or the socialist party was endorsed, and doubtless during the next couple of months the political pot will boil in every part of the country so far as the labor element is concerned. This is an interesting epoch in American working class history. No socialist can afford to regard the coming political upheaval with indifference. With but slight effort on the part of the 25,000 members of the Socialist Party we can double and treble the membership, and it wouldn't require a hundred thousand enrolled members to put the Gompsonian pure and simple capitalistic political scheme out of business forever. It's up to socialist everywhere to get busy!

BOOK REVIEWS

THE BITTER CRY OF THE CHILDREN, by John Spargo. *The Macmillan Co.* Cloth, 337 pages, \$1.50.

"The burden and blight of poverty fall most heavily upon the children." This opening sentence of Comrade Spargo's work is expanded throughout the pages which follow. This poverty of which he complains is not the poverty which now and then gives rise to a sensational case of starvation: "It is the chronic underfeeding day after day, month after month, year after year. . . . There may be food sufficient as to quantity but qualitatively poor and almost wholly lacking in nutritive value."

Under these conditions "Poverty and Death are grim companions. . . . As we ascend the social scale, the span of life lengthens and the death rate greatly diminishes. The death rate of the poorest class of workers being three and one-half times as great as that of the well-to-do." "Harmless diseases," which are only jokes among those for whom an adequate income provides proper care, are death-dealing scourges amidst the poor. Poverty curses the babe unborn and begins at birth to slowly strangle its chance of life. Yet in spite of parental poverty the children come into the world well nigh equal. This fact is one which has been generally overlooked and one which it is fortunate that the author emphasizes, since it effectually does away with the argument founded upon a sort of predestination.

After an examination of the much discussed figures of Robert Hunter, supplemented by extensive original investigation in which it was discovered that many of the children in New York were actually too hungry to eat wholesome food, he finally comes to the conclusion that "all the data available tend to show that no less than two million children of school-age in the United States are the victims of poverty which denies them common necessities, particularly adequate nourishment."

From the school child he proceeds to a consideration of the "Working Child." "Children have always worked, but it is only since the reign of the machine that their work has been synonymous with slavery." The co-operative family handicraft of a century and more ago was educative, helpful and subject to the parental interest and affection.

Once more an examination of official statistics, supplemented by a study at first hand, shows that previous estimates of child labor have almost uniformly been too low and the author finally concludes that "it would I think be quite within the mark to say that the number of child-workers under fifteen years is at least 2,250,000." Several of various industries in which this quota of child-slaves toil are examined. The lot of the working child in the textile industries, north and south, the glass factories and the Pennsylvania coal breakers are sketched, as well as that

of the little toilers in the canning factories of the open country and the sweat shops of the great city.

The physical defects of child labor are almost invariably injurious. "It is a certain and indisputable fact that where children are employed, the most unhealthy work is given them." Their lungs are choked with powder blasts and clouds of lint dust, or devoured with the alkaline powder of soap factories; they are stifled in the artificial moisture of spinning and weaving rooms, or dyed like cloth in the great color vats of the dye factories. They inhale the poisonous fumes from varnish, or die with the "phossy-jaw" of the match factory. Thus modern industry, like a great cannibal, devours the children of the workers.

The moral atmosphere of the factory reeks with a rottenness only comparable to the physical fumes which some of these industries give forth.

Yet the working child is wholly unnecessary in modern society and only exists because "cheap production is the maxim of success in industry and a plentiful supply of cheap labor is a powerful contributor to that end. Even under capitalism, machinery can be substituted for children in many cases. "There is no need of human street sweepers, . . . any more than there is need of little boys working in the glass factories. . . . In each case machinery has been invented to do the work." But it is a question of profits and when profits run contrary to human life, lives must give way. It is not the parents who are to blame for child labor, as some of our bourgeois philanthropists would have us believe, but rather the "poverty of the poor." In many cases the trifling earnings of the child mean just the difference between passing over the margin of physical suffering and the maintenance of a fairly healthy animal existence.

The chapter on "Remedial Measures" is apologized for by the author, and we cannot but feel that the criticism which he anticipates from the socialists is deserved, and that a few pages given to show the fundamental changes necessary to meet the problems he has posited would have added much value to the book. However the remedies which he suggests would certainly accomplish much to blunt the edge of the suffering of the children of the poor while capitalism lasts. Beginning at birth, he would insist on competently trained midwives, the establishment of municipal crèches with a publicly controlled milk supply and systematic education of mothers. For the school child he refers us to the school kitchens established by the socialists of Europe; while for the general problem of child labor, he outlines a plan of more stringent and effective legislation.

The book as a whole will rank along side of Hunter's "Poverty" as a store house of facts for socialist workers.

THE COST OF COMPETITION, by *Sidney A. Reeve*. McClure, Phillips & Co. Cloth, 617 pp. \$2.00.

Had the author of this work frankly admitted the Marxian foundation for most of his premises, and accepted the already established phraseology for the subject-matter of his treatise the result would have been much more intelligible to the average reader, and a greater contribution to political economy. Laying aside these defects, which after all are superficial, even if of considerable importance, the book is a valuable analysis of some phases of the present economic system. Never has the waste that accompanies the production and distribution of commodities under capitalism been as fully stated. Although there is a conscious effort to avoid definite statement it is plain that the writer is a socialist in all fundamental theoretical points. It is almost impossible to summarize the book because of its condensed character and its free use of diagrams.

He concludes that "the average cost of competition is at least twice that of production," and from the data presented this seems like an over-modest estimate.

MAKING OF THE WORLD, by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer, translated by Ernst Untermann. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth 150 pages, 50 cents.

This companion volume to "The End of the World," is a survey of the astronomical and geological processes, which according to scientific hypotheses contribute to the origin of the earth. Beginning with a study of existing nebulae, the structure of which is made clear by some excellent photographs, the author proceeds to a discussion of the processes of gaseous condensation from which a solid body was to finally evolve. The various geological stages with their more striking characteristics are swiftly sketched.

As a small entertaining sketch of some phases of geology, this book cannot but be of great value. That the theory of La Place is adhered to throughout and no mention is made of the Planetesimal Theory is perhaps the only criticism that could be made. The translation, as are all those of Comrade Untermann, is thoroughly well done.

LOOKING FORWARD, *A Treatise on the Status of Woman and the Origin and Growth of the Family and the State*, by Philip Rappaport. In the *International Library of Social Science*. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 234 pages, \$1.00.

One impression will be certainly gained by every reader of this work and that is that all institutions are in the process of change and that that change is governed by evolutionary laws. The chapters on "The Status of Woman" and "The Family" are largely based on the work of Morgan and Engels, although considerable new matter is introduced, especially with regard to present conditions and American history. The discussion of divorce on the other hand is almost exclusively an examination of existing conditions and seems to be almost the only chapter in which the evolutionary idea is not developed. His discussion on the state supplies a much needed condensation of the history of the evolution of that institution. Hitherto discussions of this subject have either been fragmentary or too voluminous for the ordinary reader. The final chapters on the "Modern Economic System" and "Conclusion" gives the orthodox socialist treatment of industrial life and its probable outcome.

The author has succeeded in condensing a great amount of valuable information into a comparatively small compass and the book must long continue to be a reference work for the every-day socialist agitator who has not the time to go to original resources.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

Socialist Books in Press or Lately Published.

MARX'S "CAPITAL."

During the last four years our co-operative publishing house has been circulating an increasing number of copies of the London edition of the first volume of Marx's "Capital." The demand for this book is now so large that it becomes possible for us to issue an edition of our own. Moreover, through the generosity of Comrade Eugene Dietzgen, Comrade Ernest Untermann has been enabled to give most of his time for more than a year to the translation of the second and third volumes of Marx's work, which as yet have never appeared in the English language.

We have already closed our contract for the printing of the first volume and the work will be completed within a few weeks. Just what this volume contains and does not contain is clearly explained in the following "Editorial Note" by Comrade Untermann, which will be prefixed to the volume when it appears.

EDITOR'S NOTE TO THE FIRST AMERICAN EDITION.

The original plan of Marx, as outlined in his preface to the first German edition of "Capital" in 1867, was to divide his work into three volumes. Volume I was to contain Book I, "The Process of Capitalist Production." Volume II was scheduled to comprise both Book II, "The Process of Capitalist Circulation" and Book III, "The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole." The work was to close with volume III, containing Book IV, "A History of Theories of Surplus-Value."

When Marx proceeded to elaborate his work for publication, he had the essential portions of all three volumes, with a few exceptions, worked out in their main analyses and conclusions, but in a very loose and unfinished form. Owing to ill health, he completed only Volume I. He died on March 14, 1883, just when a third German edition of this volume was being prepared for the printer.

Frederick Engels, the intimate friend and co-operator of Marx, stepped into the place of his dead comrade and proceeded to complete the work. In the course of the elaboration of Volume II it was found that it would be wholly taken up with Book II, "The Process of Capitalist Circulation." Its first German edition did not appear until May, 1885, almost 18 years after the first volume.

The publication of the third volume was delayed still longer. When the second German edition of Volume II appeared in July, 1893, Engels was still working on Volume III. It was not until October, 1894, that

the first German edition of Volume III was published, in two separate parts, containing the subject matter of what had been originally planned as Book III of Volume II and treating of the "Capitalist Process of Production as a Whole."

The reasons for the delay in the publication of Volumes II and III, and the difficulties encountered in solving the problem of elaborating the copious notes of Marx into a finished and connected presentation of his theories, have been fully explained by Engels in his various prefaces to these two volumes. His great modesty led him to belittle his own share in this fundamental work. As a matter of fact a large portion of the contents of "Capital" is as much a creation of Engels as though he had written it independently of Marx.

Engels intended to issue the contents of the manuscripts for Book IV, originally planned as Volume III, in the form of a fourth volume of "Capital." But on the 6th of August, 1895, less than one year after the publication of Volume III, he followed his co-worker into the grave, still leaving this work incomplete.

However, some years previous to his demise, and in anticipation of such an eventuality, he had appointed Karl Kautsky, the editor of "Die Neue Zeit," the scientific organ of the German Socialist Party, as his successor and familiarized him personally with the subject matter intended for Volume IV of this work. The material proved to be so voluminous, that Kautsky, instead of making a fourth Volume of "Capital" out of it, abandoned the original plan and issued his elaboration as a separate work in two volumes under the title "Theories of Surplus-Value."

The first English translation of the first volume of "Capital" was edited by Engels and published in 1886. Marx had in the meantime made some changes in the text of the second German edition and of the French translation, both of which appeared in 1873, and he had intended to superintend personally the edition of an English version. But the state of his health interfered with this plan. Engels utilized his notes and the text of the French translation.

Owing to the fact that the title page of this English translation (published by Swan Sonnenschein & Co.) did not distinctly specify that this was but Volume I, it has often been mistaken for the complete work, in spite of the fact that the prefaces of Marx and Engels clearly pointed to the actual condition of the matter.

In 1890, four years after the publication of the first English edition, Engels edited the proofs for a fourth German edition of Volume I and enlarged it still more after a repeated comparison with the French edition and with manuscript notes of Marx. But the Swan Sonnenschein edition did not adopt this new version in its subsequent English issues.

This first American edition will be the first complete English edition of the entire Marxian theories of Capitalist Production. It will contain all three volumes of "Capital" in full. The present Volume I, deals with "The Process of Capitalist Production in the strict meaning of the term 'production.'" Volume II will treat of The process of Capitalist Circulation in the strict meaning of the term "circulation." Volume III will contain the final analysis of The process of Capitalist Production as a Whole, that is of Production and Circulation in their mutual interrelations.

The "Theories of Surplus-Value," Kautsky's elaboration of the posthumous notes of Marx and Engels, will in due time be published in an English translation as a separate work.

This first American edition of Volume I is based on the revised fourth German edition. The text of the English version of the Swan Sonnenschein edition has been compared page for page with this improved German edition, and about ten pages of new text hitherto not rendered in

English are thus presented to American readers. All the footnotes have likewise been revised and brought up to date.

For all further information concerning the technical particulars of this work I refer the reader to the prefaces of Marx and Engels.

ERNEST UTERMANN.

Orlando, Fla., July 18, 1906.

This first volume, now in press, will make, including a new topical index, nearly 900 pages, and its publication will involve an immediate outlay of about \$1250. We have until now made no special effort to obtain advance orders for the book, since we prefer not to keep comrades waiting too long for their copies. The work of typesetting is now however so nearly completed that we must face the question of obtaining the large sum of money necessary to pay for the electrotype plates. A large proportion of this sum ought to be raised from the first sales of the book. The retail price will be \$2.00, while the price to stockholders in our co-operative publishing house will be \$1.00 unless the postage or expressage is prepaid by us, in which case it will be \$1.20. The book is one which should be in every socialist library however small and we hope to receive enough advance orders within a very short time to cover nearly, if not quite, the cost of the work.

MORGAN'S ANCIENT SOCIETY.

We have to make another announcement only less important than that of our edition of Marx's "Capital". The great work of Lewis H. Morgan, entitled "Ancient Society, or Researches in The Lines of Human Progress From Savagery Trough Barbarism to Civilization," was published nearly thirty years ago and has had a tremendous influence on the social theories of European and American students ever since. Frederick Engels in his little work entitled "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State" has summarized the work of Morgan and pointed out the importance of his researches in affording proofs of the socialist theories of the development of society. Morgan's work itself has, however, remained little known, except to special students, and is especially unfamiliar to members of the working class, for the reason that it has always been sold at an extremely high price.

The copyright has now expired and we have closed a contract for the publication of our edition of this great work. We shall reduce the price from \$4.00 to \$1.50, and it will be subject to our usual discount to stockholders, so that by subscribing for stock in this publishing house one can obtain the book at 75c, unless we prepay postage or expressage, in which case it will cost 90c.

NEW VOLUMES OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

This new library of sociological books in handsome binding retailing at \$1.00 a copy was started at the beginning of 1906, the initial volume being "The Changing Order," by Dr. Oscar Lovell Triggs. Eight volumes have thus far been issued and three more are in preparation. The ninth volume is by Joseph Dietzgen, a writer who was long ago recognized by European socialists as a worthy co-worker of Marx and Engels. His

volume of "Philosophical Essays," which we published in this library a few weeks ago, contains for the most part his shorter and more fragmentary writings. His new volume, which we expect to issue during August, will be entitled "The Positive Outcome of Philosophy" and will contain in addition to the work from which it takes its name, his "Nature of Human Brain Work" and "Letters on Logic." These three books constitute a volume which is by far the best statement yet offered of Materialist Monism, which most international socialists believe to be a logical and necessary part of the socialist philosophy. It is certainly a work that every thoughtful socialist would enjoy studying no matter whether his predisposition may be in favor of or opposed to materialist monism.

The tenth volume of the International Library of Social Science will be "Socialism and Philosophy" by Antonio Labriola, already well known by American socialists from his "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History." Labriola's new work is in the form of letters to Sorel, a prominent French socialist who was originally instrumental in bringing Labriola's works to the attention of his countrymen, but who has since then executed several fantastic changes of front. The familiar style of these letters makes them far easier reading than the "Essays."

The eleventh volume will be "The Physical Basis of Mind and Morals" by M. H. Fitch. This work is a critical study of the evolution theory and its applications to social science and ethics. The author reviews the work of Darwin and Spencer, and shows how theology reappears under another form in many who think themselves evolutionists. What we call mind is produced by brain tissue, and morality, like life itself, is a correspondence of the individual with this environment. The author develops and applies this thought in a series of interesting chapters.

NEW VOLUMES IN THE STANDARD SOCIALIST SERIES.

Fourteen volumes in this popular series, retailing at 50 cents, have already been published and three more are in preparation.

The fifteenth will be entitled "Social and Philosophical Studies," by Paul Lafargue of Paris, one of the foremost socialists of Europe and already well known to American readers through his books, "The Evolution of Property," "The Sale of an Appetite" and "Socialism and the Intellectuals" and numerous articles that have appeared in the International Socialist Review. Our original plan was to include in this book a number of these articles, but after the work of translation was under way, comrade Lafargue sent us a book containing a series of studies on the "Origin of Abstract Ideas," which with the "Causes of Belief in God" with which the volume opens, will make a book of the usual size in this series without including any material which has heretofore appeared in the English language. In these studies Lafargue takes as his text Marx's statement: "The mode of production of the physical means of life dominates as a rule the development of the social, political and intellectual life." This guiding principle enables him to show clearly why the capitalist class in civilized countries is usually religious, while the wage workers are irreligious. He also traces the remote origins of the ideas of Justice and Goodness, which serve so useful a purpose in maintaining the capitalist order of things.

The sixteenth volume will be a revised and enlarged edition of "What's So and What Isn't," by John M. Work, which has heretofore been published in pamphlet form by the *Appeal to Reason*. This is distinctively a propaganda book, for those who have thus far read little or nothing on the subject of socialism. The author in his preface disclaims any knowledge of literary style, but he has nevertheless a style which is

remarkably clear and forceful. We know no other book so well adapted to remove certain current misconceptions of socialism.

The seventeenth volume will be Karl Kautsky's latest work, entitled "Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History," translated by John B. Askew. This work unlike the one just mentioned will deal largely with the questions on which socialists differ to some extent among themselves, and it will be welcomed by every student who desires to keep abreast with the best socialist thought. The author reviews ancient and Christian ethics, the ethics of the Renaissance, the ethic of Kant and the ethic of Darwinism, and devotes the latter half of his book to a comprehensive study of the ethics of Marxism. This work is undoubtedly the most important contribution to the development of the theory of historical materialism that has appeared for several years.

SOCIALIST FICTION.

The volume of stories by May Beals, entitled, "The Rebel at Large," already announced in these pages, is now ready. These are charming stories, which will at first sight interest readers who know nothing of socialism, while their effect will inevitably be to create a decided interest in the subject on the part of any who are not hopelessly committed to the party of the ruling class. Mechanically, the volume is in the same shape as the Standard Socialist Series, or the Library of Science for the Workers, but is bound in the same cloth used in the International Library of Social Science, and has a new and distinctive cover design.

The same design is used in the second edition of "God's Children" by James Allman, which has just been published. This "Modern Allegory" is one of the most vigorous arguments against capitalism ever written and the continued demand has made a new edition necessary. Both of these volumes retail at 50c, with the usual terms to stockholders.

AS TO FINANCES.

The book sales for July did not quite reach the phenomenal figure for June, but they amount to \$1,278.14, as compared with \$787.62 for July 1905. The receipts from the sale of stock last month were \$277.62, as compared with \$153.15 in July 1905. The receipts of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW last month were \$148.45, a slight gain over the figures of a year ago, which were \$142.82. It will be thus seen that the problem of ways and means for continuing the REVIEW has yet to be solved, since its publication costs \$200 a month.

Just at present, however, the immediate problem is the raising of about \$3,000, which will be required within the next few weeks, for the publication of the new books which are in press. Nearly the whole of this sum can readily be raised from the sale of the books themselves, if every reader of this announcement will send promptly for such books as interest him. Those who are not already subscribers for stock will find that their book money will go much further in the long run by subscribing for a share and thus getting the special discounts to which shareholders are entitled. The money received for stock is all used for the purpose of making electrotypes of new books, and each new stockholder at once gets the privilege of buying at a discount the books which had previously been published with the capital subscribed by others. The number of stockholders now stands at 1428.

A share of stock costs ten dollars, and it may be paid for at the rate of \$1.00 a month. If however any one who is not yet a stockholder will send ten dollars at one time during the month of August, we will issue a full-paid certificate and will also send prepaid a copy of the new edition of the first volume of "Capital" as soon as published.